The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

Volume I, Number 3

July, 1939

Published by

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON, D. C.

EDITORIAL STAFF

Rev. Wendell S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D., *Chief Editor*
St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., M.A., S.T.D.
Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

Reverend Edward Donzé, S.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Rev. John Rowen, S.T.D., S.S.L.
St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.

Rev. Charles Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.
Augustinian College, Washington, D. C.

Rev. Cyril Gaul, O.S.B., *Publishing Editor*
St. Meinrad Seminary, St. Meinrad, Ind.

The CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October, by the Catholic Biblical Association, Cum Permissu Superiorum.

The subscription price is $5.00 the year; single copies $1.50.

"Application pending for entry as second class matter at the post office at Washington, D. C.; Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at St. Meinrad, Indiana is pending."

Address all communications to
THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION
Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

Editorial Notes 201
Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.

The Eschatological Discourse 204
Rev. A. C. Cotter, S.J.

The Curriculum of Scriptural Studies in our Seminaries ... 214
Rev. Edward J. Byrne, S.T.D.

St. Mark the Disciple of St. Peter and St. Paul 223
Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.

The Supernatural Origin of Israel's Religion 232
Rev. John J. Dougherty

Father Lagrange on Jesus and His Message 239
Rev. Edward J. Byrne, S.T.D.

Obscurities of the Latin Psalter 243
Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

Titles in Mt. 23:8-12 249
Rev. W. S. Reilly, S.S., S.T.D., S.S.D.

The Unjust Steward 250
Rev. Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Saint John's Evidence of the Resurrection 253
Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

The Revised Translation of the Epistle to the Theosalonians. 256
Rev. Charles Costello, O.M.I., S.T.D.

Archeological Corner 264
Rev. Edward A. Cerny, S.S., S.T.D.

Biblical News 267
Rev. Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.

Book Reviews 272

The True Vine and its Branches, Edward Leen, C.S.Sp. A. BELLWALD, S.M.

And It Came to Pass, Hayyim Nahman Bialik. EDWARD H. DONZÉ, S.M.

Readings in St. John's Gospel, William Temple.

An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel, E. Basil Redlich.

The Gospel Sources, Dorothy F. Wilson. WILLIAM L. NEWTON.

The Strophic Structure of Hebrew Poetry, Charles Franklin Kraft. ALBERT MICHAEL CASEY, S.J.

St. Paul, Arthur Darby Nock. JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

The False Prophets of the Old Testament, Edward F. Siegman, C.PP.S. PATRICK W. Skehan.

The World's Oldest Writings. Henry James Reynolds. JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

Studies in the First and Second Kings and First and Second Chronicles, Grace Saxe. JOHN EV. UJLAKI, O.S.B.

What We Mean by Religion, Ira Eisenstein. PATRICK W. SKEHAN.

The Holy Scripture, Deuteronomy with Commentary, Joseph Reider. JOHN F. DOUGHERTY.

The Pharisees, The Sociological Background of Their Faith, Louis Finkelstein. EDWARD H. DONZÉ.

Once—In Palestine, Lucille Papin Borden. CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

A BIBLICAL JUBILEE

The school year 1939-1940 is the fiftieth year of St. Stephen's Biblical School of Jerusalem. Its founder, Father Lagrange, enunciated its program in the *Revue Biblique* of 1900 under the heading, "Project of a Complete Commentary of the Sacred Scriptures." He tells of the need of a Catholic commentary, based on a good translation of the original text, in harmony with the findings of careful textual criticism and giving particular attention to literary criticism; and he appeals for collaborators. Some fellow-workers he found in the Dominican Convent of Jerusalem to which the Biblical School is attached. Father Vincent, who was one of his first pupils, specialized in Palestinian archeology and is the principal authority on that subject. Father Abel, who came somewhat later, has written the most complete and scholarly books that exist on the geography of the Holy Land. A very bright light has recently risen in the person of Father de Vaux, now head of the School and editor of the *Revue Biblique*. I mention only a few of the names of those Dominican Fathers of whom Catholics everywhere are proud.

But the fellow-workers for whom Father Lagrange appealed did not all come from his own convent and school. In the collection of *Etudes Bibliques* he gathered notable works of many scholars, some on linguistics and history, some on introductions of various kinds, some on those commentaries which he desired above all. The principal works of this big collection, however, came from his own great mind and his tireless pen. The French did not need commentaries as badly as English-speaking Catholics do today; but they, as well as others who read French books, have profited immensely by the work of Father Lagrange. Rarely has a professor of Sacred Scripture (I can think only of St. Jerome) received such a tribute of gratitude, based on scholarly appreciation, as was paid the venerable Dominican on the occasion of his fiftieth birthday in a book entitled *L'oeuvre exégétique et historique du R. P. Lagrange.* Cardinal Liénard of Lille, who has recently been made a member of the Biblical Commission, has written the preface. It contains articles by particularly qualified authors who tell of their master's influence, of his work on the Old Testament and Semitism; of his work on the New Testament and his hellenist studies; of his writings on religions

which for some reason have been compared to Judaism and Christianity.

On the occasion of the Biblical School's fiftieth year, the Editor of the *Revue Biblique* suggests some kind of a celebration. He does not invite his readers to Jerusalem, where there are troubles at present, but thinks it would be well for the friends of Father Lagrange and the Biblical School to collaborate in another book—a florilegium in which his method should be applied, his principles appreciated in short monographs, etc. Souvenirs and reminiscences would not be excluded. The project is as yet a little nebulous, but leave it to Frenchmen to write the book!

Father Lagrange admired in German scholars their ability to unite to procure indispensable tools, to produce collective works. The *Thesaurus* of the Latin language, for instance, represents the collective efforts of several learned bodies. He admired also their success in securing continuity. Nothing is more favorable to the advancement of learning than handing down the same works in editions kept strictly up to date. Thus Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar was revised by Kautzsch, and others have replaced Kautzsch as revisers. Father Lagrange aimed at obtaining something of this co-ordination and continuity through his Biblical School and his review.

His efforts have been successful beyond what might have been expected, thanks to his own genius and organizing power; thanks also to the fact that the Dominican Order was able to recognize his merit and to utilize his talents. It stood by him wonderfully; and no religious was more loyal to his order. He told me one day as we were walking from Jerusalem to Ain Karem that he had never published a line which had not been submitted to his superiors in Rome. On this occasion he remarked that when the history of these times is written one whose merits will stand out brightly is the Reverend Father Lepidi, O.P., Master of the Sacred Palace.

A good summary of the work to be done by Catholic scholars may be found in the preface of a book which I have translated under the title, *The Meaning of Christianity according to Luther and his Followers in Germany.* It is a good refutation of what German rationalists or liberal Protestants have written about Christ and the Church. Referring to them he says:

> The work to be done by Catholic scholars is suggested by the experience of their enemies. The anti-dogmatic exegesis of the Germans

profited by their philological and historical studies. It is repeatedly asserted that those who are competent in the knowledge of etymology and of syntax more readily understand the sense of a text; that those who have accumulated all the means of knowing antiquity, are the men who are best fitted to appreciate the religious movement of Judaism and Christianity. Who can deny the plausibility of this assertion? We must have scholars of equal competence, able to discern between what is based on the scientific knowledge of language and of history, and what is derived from the philosophical theories of the exegete; able to detect the subjective element which glides in between the technical explanation of words and sentences and the appreciation of their meaning, between exegesis in the strict sense and the exegetical system taken as a whole, with its presuppositions and assumptions. These Catholic exegetes must be sufficiently trained in textual criticism to call attention to arbitrary alterations or rejections of texts; they must be sufficiently versed in the comparative study of religions to judge the various manifestations of the religious spirit and to denounce the prejudice which would place on an equal footing manifestations which are very unequal. To fit oneself for the work which the present condition of biblical science imposes upon the Catholic scholar, there is manifestly much work to be done; and those who have at heart to accomplish the task which confronts them, must not neglect the lessons of organization of which the Germans have given us the example. Work and organization are the secret of their efficiency.

Father Lagrange had been paying close attention to the movements of thought in Germany ever since he founded St. Stephen's Biblical school; for a time the *Revue Biblique* was the only Catholic review which analyzed the books and refuted the rationalistic contentions of non-Catholic German scholars. All admitted the fairness of his analyses at least. And he learned a great deal from his opponents. Some thought he took too much of their teaching; but he, and most of those who have followed his work, were confident that he was only carrying out the ideas of Pius X in his letter to Msgr. Le Camus:

> As we must condemn the rashness of those who, more docile to the seductions of novelty than to the teaching of the Church, do not hesitate to indulge in excessive freedom in the matter of biblical criticism, it is likewise incumbent upon us to disapprove of the attitude of those who do not dare to break in any way with current views in regard to the meaning of the Scriptures, even when, faith remaining unaffected, the wise progress of studies imperiously invites them to do so.

W. S. R.

THE ESCHATOLOGICAL DISCOURSE

(Concluded)

After the preliminaries discussed in the previous article (pp. 125-132), we now approach the main issue, an analysis of the discourse itself. Speaking by and large, the outline here proposed is not strictly new; it is mentioned or at least hinted at in several commentaries. Nor is the principle on which I shall base my analysis, entirely new; Père Lagrange has expounded it accurately and felicitously in the *Revue biblique* of 1906 and again in his "Evangile de Jésus-Christ" (pp. 476-478).

General Outline

In our Lord's answer to the question (or questions) put to Him by the Apostles, there seem to be contained three essential and distinct parts: a) General admonitions, b) the signs of the imminent destruction of Jerusalem, c) the parousia or the coming of the Son of Man.

Before explaining and proving this division, let me note two points on which exegetes are not unanimous:

a. Whereas they are generally agreed that the discourse includes the last two parts, few would accept the first heading "General Admonitions." But following Fathers Knabenbauer and Prat, I shall prove that this is indeed the idea underlying the beginning of our Lord's answer.

b. It is agreed that in the rest of the discourse our Lord spoke both of the destruction of Jerusalem and of the parousia. The special problem is to mark off clearly where He spoke of the one and where of the other.

At the conclusion of the article I shall point out several advantages for the exegesis of the Gospels resulting from the division here proposed.

General Admonitions

These are contained in Mt. 24:1-14; Mk. 13:5-13; Lk. 21:8-19. I shall first give a brief exposition of the contents of these sections, and then prove that they have indeed a purpose different from the rest of the discourse.

1. Our Lord did not at once answer the question put to Him by the Apostles. One might almost say that He brushed it aside

as idle curiosity, as of little importance, as secondary in the work which He was to entrust to them. And looking more closely, we may distinguish two aspects of this introductory part:

a. Our Lord unrolls before the eyes of the Apostles a picture of the *every-day life* of His Church throughout the centuries. He predicts false prophets, dangers from within and without, persecutions on all sides, scandals and sad defections. No, the messianic kingdom would bear little resemblance to the fond imaginings of the Apostles or the seductive descriptions of the apocalyptic literature of the Jews. It was not to be the glorious millennium, such as some early Christians pictured to themselves. The Church militant would never be the Church triumphant. Rather, the saying of Our Lord recorded by St. John (16:33), "in the world you have affliction," may fitly be regarded as a summary of this first section of the discourse.

b. But our Lord's chief purpose was not the sketching of a chronological outline of things to come. His purpose was eminently practical. He wished to teach the Apostles an *important lesson,* to advise them for the day of trial: Let them beware of false prophets; let them not lose heart when persecution breaks upon them or apostasy saddens them; let them trust in divine Providence through all the vicissitudes of human history; above all, let them attend to the spread of the Gospel; nothing else matters; nothing must interfere with that; and its triumphant advance in the face of heart-breaking failures should forever be their pride and consolation.

What a majestic outlook! What a salutary lesson! We can see now, after 1900 years, how true to life was our Lord's picture, and how necessary was the lesson for His followers. But history tells us also that the lesson has not been forgotten in the Church.

2. Not all exegetes, as I have said, agree on this interpretation. Many think that our Lord begins at once to give a direct answer to the question of the Apostles, that He is already predicting signs which are to precede either the destruction of Jerusalem or the end of the world. Some, going more into detail, distinguish between the signs of the destruction of Jerusalem and those bearing on the end of the world; the former would be contained in Mt. 24:4-8, the latter in Mt. 24:9-14. Others again think that all signs refer to the fall of the city, but typify those preceding the end of the world.

One main argument militates against all these hypotheses: The things enumerated are far too general and *vague* to serve as signs for any definite event. Truth to tell, was there ever an epoch in which these things were totally absent? in which there were no false prophets, no wars or rumors of wars, no earthquakes, no scandals or persecutions? St. Gregory the Great, referring the "signs" to the end of the world, thought that many of them had already come to pass in his own day, and that there were indications of the speedy fulfillment of the rest. We who live twelve centuries after him, are less positive.

A second argument is this: Our Lord twice states *explicitly* that the things adduced in this section do not mean the end of the world: "The end is not yet" (Mt. 24:6; cf. Lk. 21:9); "all these things are only the beginning of sorrows" (Mt. 24:8; cf. Lk. 21:19).

Father Knabenbauer (In Mt. II pp. 316-318, 324) further argues that, our Lord here intended to predict signs of the downfall of Jerusalem, His prediction would have been false. No pseudo-Messiah (Mt. 24:5) arose prior to that event; it would be awkward to identify the false prophets who then did arise, with the pseudo-Messiah.

I shall not discuss this point at present, but only remark that, our Lord's outlook being all-comprehensive, He did not exclude the two principal events mentioned in the Apostles' question. In fact, He seems to have stressed them somewhat and so to have led up to their separate discussion. The "terrors from the sky and the great signs" of which we read in Luke (21:11), may apply more particularly to the end of the world.

3. But here an objection should be faced.

Theologians, in their treatise on eschatology, enumerate various signs which are to foreshadow the approach of the end of the world. And they draw at least some of the signs from the first section of the eschatological discourse. Thus Father Gächter (in *LThK* s.v. Parusie) mentions four signs based on it: the universal preaching of the Gospel (Mt. 24:14; Mk. 13:10), the rise of many seducers (Mk. 13:5-6), the great apostasy (Mt. 24:4 sqq.; Lk. 17:26 sqq.), revolutions and catastrophes (Mk. 13:7-8). About the same signs with the same references are given by Father Pesch in his *Praelectiones Dogmaticae* (IX n. 675-681).

But now, if our analysis be correct, these signs lose their scriptural basis; for the passages referred to belong to the "General Admonitions," and therefore do not contain signs.

The answer would not seem too difficult. Father Gächter himself admits (l.c.) that one can speak of negative signs here: these things will come to pass before the end of the world. St. Augustine already made the same observation with regard to the first sign mentioned, the spread of the Gospel everywhere: " 'Tunc veniet' quid est nisi 'ante non veniet'? Quanto post veniat, incertum nobis est. Ante tamen non esse venturum, dubitare utique non debemus" (Ep. 197 n. 4). It seems that such a view of these signs fits in perfectly with my exposition.

THE PROPHECIES

All exegetes are agreed that the rest of the discourse refers both to the fall of Jerusalem and to the end of the world. The difficulty consists in delimiting where our Lord speaks of the one and where of the other. It is in the hope of contributing something towards its solution that this is written.

Now even a cursory reading reveals one outstanding fact: our Lord emphatically *contrasts* the two events. He professes *to know* when the destruction of the city is to occur; He gives the Apostles various signs of the approaching event, and solemnly warns them to remember His words; He knows that the disaster will be localized, so that one can escape it; He reveals that its horrors will last some time, would last longer "if the days had not been shortened for the sake of the elect" (Mk. 13:20). But He professes *not to know* the day nor the hour when the end of the world is to come, though He does say that this event will be universal and above all as sudden as the lightning; hence He calls it "that day."

And the practical purpose both of the revelations and of their distinction? Our Lord insists that the Apostles should heed the signs of the former event and *prepare* themselves in due time. But for the end of the world He has only one stern advice to give, repeated insistently: Watch ye, *be prepared.*

This evident distinction shall be our guide in dividing the discourse into its constituent parts. For seeing that our Lord speaks of two events, but so as to contrast one with the other, we shall apply the principle common to all speakers who desire to bring out a contrast. By running through each of the synoptics

separately, we shall see that each is divided into 4 sections, which can be classified as referring to one or the other event.

1. Matthew

a. Mt. 24:15-25 evidently refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. Our Lord indicates signs which can be understood as such (v. 15), flight is possible, though urgent (v. 16-18), the tribulations will last many days (v. 19-22), during which false prophets will arise (v. 23-24). Lastly, He tells the disciples that this is a prophecy (v. 25), implying, of course, that they should keep it in mind and later act accordingly.

Still, extending the first section so as to include v. 21-25 gives rise to three disputed questions. Is it historically true that the destruction of Jerusalem was the greatest of all disasters (v. 21), that the time of trial was mercifully shortened (v. 22), and that prior to it many pseudo-Messiahs arose (v. 23-24)? Many exegetes, convinced that these things did not then come to pass, conclude the first section with v. 20 or v. 22. Others fall back on what is called "compenetration," a form of prediction in which the prophet passes from type to antitype without indicating any change of reference.

Now the objections taken from v. 21 and 22 are hardly serious. The expressions of v. 21 need not necessarily be taken in the strictest literal sense; our Lord may have spoken in hyperbole or He may have used Old Testament passages to describe the horrors of that historical event. Nor is it impossible or improbable that the days of trial were shortened by divine Providence in a manner unknown to us.

With regard to v. 23-24, Father Knabenbauer insists that there were no false Messiahs prior to the fall of Jerusalem. He is seconded by Montefiore, who says: "We know of nobody before Bar Cochba, who claimed to be the Messiah" (The Synoptic Gospels, I, p. 298). Still, one may ask whether it is necessary to take the term "Messiah" in the strict sense here. Père Fillion does not think so. He says in his Life of Christ (III p. 328): "Although we cannot point to any false Messiahs, properly so-called, during this period, there were at least, in a similar role, Simon Magus, the Theudas, whose sinister adventure is recorded by Josephus, and others besides, all of them engaged in seducing the people in one way or another." His view is shared by Le Camus (Life of Christ, III, pp. 119-120), Fouard (Life of Christ II, pp. 204-205) and Lusseau-Collomb (IV, p. 738).

The issue would seem to be determined by what we read in v. 25. The saying "lo, I have foretold you" definitely points to that event of which our Lord deigned to indicate the time. And that is only the destruction of Jerusalem.

But one may doubt whether Mt. 24:26 should be drawn to this or the following section. The corresponding section in Mk. rather favors the former.

b. By contrast to the first section, Mt. 24:27-31 clearly visualizes the coming of the Son of Man. The term 'parousia' itself is used, and its suddenness as well as universality are described in two vivid similes: the lightning which in an instant spreads from one end of the sky to the other, and the vultures which, without a sign visible to man, appear suddenly from all points in the sky.[1]

c. Continuing now and following out our principle of contrast, we must say that in Mt. 24:32-35 our Lord returns to the fall of Jerusalem. The Apostles are again told to heed the signs foretold and to prepare as does the Palestinian farmer; the duration of the event is compared to the long Palestinian summer; the time is fixed as falling within the generation then living. Finally, lest His disciples should doubt or forget the prophecy, He appeals to His divine authority: "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away."

d. The contrast with this prophecy strikes the eye as we go on to read Mt. 24:36. Whereas our Lord had plainly announced that the destruction of the city would occur within their generation, He solemnly professes not to know the time of the parousia. He knows only two things concerning it: it will be sudden and universal. Therefore, through the rest of chapter 24 and the greater part of chapter 25, He repeats—we might almost say monotonously, were it not for an abundance of the most striking parables—"watch ye," "you do not know the hour," "be prepared."

2. Mark

a. The prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem is contained in Mk. 13:14-23. It parallels Matthew's account so closely that there is no need of repetition.

[1] On the meaning of the second simile see *de Marchi*, in Verbum Domini, 1938, pp. 329-333.

In fact, if Mk. 13:21-23 were not so evidently parallel to Mt. or if it were placed elsewhere, one might refer it back to "General Admonitions." Certainly, the passage does not differ much from Mt. 24:5 and Mk. 13:6; Luke has nothing parallel to it except 21:8.

b. The parousia is evidently referred to in Mk. 13:24-27. The contrast to the first prophecy, though less apparent, is not altogether absent. It seems even stressed by the particle ἀλλά, which always expresses emphatic opposition or diversity.

But Mark omits the two similes by which the suddenness and universality of the event are illustrated in Mt.

c. In Mk. 13:28-31 our Lord returns to the fate of the holy city. The parallel with Mt. 24:32-35 is again so unmistakable that repetition would be useless.

d. The contrast between Mk. 13:32-37 and what precedes, is as clear as in the corresponding section of Mt. But Mark sketches only the one parable of the "master of the house" to inculcate the necessity of being always watchful and ready.

3. Luke

a. Luke's account of the prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem is evidently contained in Lk. 21:20-24. But while the substance of the account corresponds with that in the other synoptics, the features which are characteristic there and which contrast it with the parousia, are less marked; the warning proverb "let him who readeth, understand" is absent; so is the announcement of false prophets.

b. Lk. 21:25-28 clearly refers to the second coming. But the contrast with the other event is less conspicuous; neither is its suddenness emphasized. In fact, some expressions might lead one to think of slow motion and considerable duration: "the signs" (v. 25), "the expectations of what is to come" (v. 26), "then" (v. 27), "when these things begin to happen" (v. 28), "your redemption is nigh" (v. 28). Still, the terms used do not force us to deny that these things may all be practically simultaneous, not long drawn out as in the case of the destruction of Jerusalem. Indeed, the fourth section (v. 34) speaks of it as one day.

c. Though the next sentence begins with καί, Lk. 21:29-33 is evidently a return to the fall of the city. The account does not differ materially from the parallel parts of Mt. and Mk.

d. Lk. 21:34-36 refers again to the second coming. Luke omits our Lord's saying about not knowing its date. However, to lead up to the moral lesson of preparedness, He not only calls the parousia "that sudden day," but compares it to the snare that unexpectedly closes in on the unwary bird, at the same time stressing its universality. Therefore "watch ye."

Summing up then, it seems that, apart from the general admonitions placed at the beginning, this is the scheme of the eschatological discourse:

a. Destruction of Jerusalem: Mt. 24:15-25; Mk. 13:14-23; Lk. 21:20-24.

b. Parousia: Mt. 24:27-31; Mk. 13:24-27; Lk. 21:25-28.

c. Destruction of Jerusalem: Mt. 24:32-35; Mk. 13:28-31; Lk. 21:29-33.

d. Parousia: Mt. 24:36–25:46; Mk. 13:32-37; Lk. 21:34-36.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The analysis of the eschatological discourse here offered has several advantages. The first is that the awkward theories of *prophetic perspective* and *compenetration* are thereby avoided.

Let me explain the theories, which are very common today, in the words of Père Lepin, who also accepts them: "Sacred prophecy usually resorts to descriptive tableaux of the future, each following the other without transitions, despite the divergence of the periods of time recorded, and especially when the events are related one to the other as cause to effect, or as symbol to the things prefigured. Hence, we may rightly think that the Saviour's discourse on the last things is a series of prophetic portrayals that refer either to the fall of Jerusalem or to the end of the world with a certain *confusion of perspectives*: a picture of the final coming might follow a description of the destruction of Palestine without it being stated that a considerable space of time should elapse between the two events" (*Christ and the Gospel*, p. 451).

I have italicized the words "confusion of perspectives"; for they contain the gist of the theories and render them so awkward when applied to our Lord. Père Lagrange rightly remarks (*L'Evangile*, p. 476, note) that such theories may perhaps be applicable to the prophets of the Old Testament, but not to our Lord. As the two events were certainly distinct in His mind,

would He doubly confuse—and that on purpose—what was already sufficiently confused in the minds of His Apostles?

Nor can it be said with Maldonatus that our Lord's answer did not distinguish the two events as the Apostles had not distinguished them in their question. We may admit that the Apostles, being under a wrong impression from the start, did not perceive the long interval between them. But our Lord seems to have done all in His power (i.e. consonant with His communicable knowledge) to point a sharp distinction. Our theory of progress by contrast brings out this endeavor on His part.

As against the theories of prophetic perspective and compenetration, the ordinary method of marking a contrast is enough to account for the sudden transitions apparent in the discourse. For, when contrasting two objects, we first point to one, then to the other; we may then go back to the first to look at it from a different angle, and pass from it again to its opposite. This process may be repeated as often and as long as we find different aspects under which the objects can be contrasted.

There is no need then of appealing either to the blurred and indistinct vision of the Hebrew seers of old or to their peculiar technique of describing future events revealed to them but imperfectly. The first explanation cannot apply to our Lord, who claimed that His knowledge was equal to the Father's (Mt. 11:27; Jn. 16:15); the second, while *a priori* plausible, is excluded by the facts of the case.

It is, however, possible and even probable that, in the memory of the Apostles and in the oral tradition of the discourse, some of our Lord's sayings should have been thrown somewhat out of focus, or that the exact sequence of thought should have become somewhat blurred. Such defects would pertain more to style than to matter, so that there was no need for the Holy Ghost to remedy them when He inspired the synoptics to write their Gospels.

2. The second advantage of our analysis is that it removes one of the greatest stumbling-blocks of Gospel exegesis.

All three synoptics record the solemn saying of Our Lord: "Amen I say to you, *this generation shall not pass away* until all those things shall be accomplished." Who can tell how much ink has been spilled over this one sentence? Father Grandmaison says of it: "It is recognized that this text presents the most difficult problem in the prophecies of Jesus. For it appears to announce as certain, within the limits of the generation then liv-

ing, the fulfillment of all that Christ had predicted, including the advent of the Son of Man as universal judge and the marshalling of all men before his tribunal" (*Jesus Christ,* III, p. 251). Loisy built his whole system on it, supposing, of course, that Christ was mistaken in His prediction.

If our analysis is correct, the difficulty vanishes into thin air. The saying occurs in that section of the discourse which refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. Many of those who lived at the time of the prediction, must have seen its fulfillment. Christ had not erred.

3. Another stumbling-block, scarcely less serious, has ever been the εὐθέως μετά in Mt. 24:29; for it seems to say or imply that the parousia would, *without delay,* follow the destruction of Jerusalem.

Again, the explanations are legion. But if we look at the summary of our analysis, the difficulty, while not precisely reduced to the vanishing point, looks less impressive. For the phrase does not mark the transition from the destruction of Jerusalem to the end of the world, but occurs *within* the section where our Lord speaks of the parousia. It may indicate the suddenness or the speedy transaction of this last act of the human drama.

To conclude. I do not, in what I have said, set myself up as the last court of appeal in the interpretation of Scripture, nor do I propose my analysis as certain. But even the kindly beam of a candle may prove a source of joy where there is so much obscurity. And I may add—on the practical side—that the eschatological discourse, generally shunned by preachers on account of its many pitfalls, is now seen to be a rich quarry of material easily molded into sermons.

A. C. COTTER, S.J.

THE CURRICULUM OF SCRIPTURAL STUDIES IN OUR SEMINARIES

The subject assigned to me by the Program Committee of the Catholic Biblical Association is "The Scriptural Curriculum in our Seminaries."* It was suggested to me in the letter, which requested me to accept this assignment, that I compose in the first place a résumé of the ecclesiastical legislation on the subject, then give a "summary of the various ways in which this legislation is interpreted, as evidenced in the actual teaching of Scripture in our American Seminaries, and finally an appreciation of some of these interpretations." These wishes of the Program Committee I have endeavored to fulfill.

While it was not indicated to me by the Committee that I should do so, I have confined my attention to the curriculum of Scriptural studies in our *Major* or *Higher* Seminaries, as the Scriptural work in our Preparatory Seminaries is ordinarily of an elementary kind, and in any case would take us too far afield. I use the term "Major or Higher Seminary" in the sense in which it is employed in the Code of Canon Law, namely, as the Institution or Institutions wherein the students for the Priesthood make their Philosophical and Theological Studies by a course of at least six years duration. I have endeavored to keep strictly to the subject of the *curriculum* of Scriptural classes therein.

Ecclesiastical legislation concerning the curriculum of Scriptural work in Seminaries is of course of two kinds, 1) that laid down for Seminaries throughout the world, and 2) that for particular countries, in our own case for the United States. It would be interesting to consider this legislation, both universal and local, in a chronological or historical way. Lack of time prevents this, and moreover such a treatment is not required by our present practical purpose. Instead of giving a complete résumé of the legislation in a continuous, historical manner, I shall, in connection with the various topics, which shall be discussed, indicate, as I go along, the legislation which affects the particular topic under consideration in a specific way, and only such legislation.

* Paper read at the Second General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America, on Oct. 2, 1938, at Hartford, Conn.

It is particularly noteworthy in passing to oberve that the legislation of the Universal Church concerning Scriptural Studies in Seminaries was before modern times ordinarily of a very general nature and that it was with the Encyclical of Leo XIII, *Providentissimus Deus,* that the legislation began to give detailed instruction concerning the subject. The legislation, which the Roman Pontiffs who have succeeded Leo have given for the Universal Church, is likewise quite specific, relative to the Seminary Curriculum. Of this legislation, it is particularly the Apostolic Letter, *Quoniam in Re Biblica,* of Pius X and the Apostolic Constitution of our late Holy Father Pius XI, *Deus Scientiarum Dominus,* which are the most specific and informing. Unfortunately, the latter Constitution with its Ordinationes binds only those Seminaries which have the power of granting Pontifical degrees, of which class there are only four at present in the United States. Even the legislation of the Code of Canon Law concerning Seminaries is rather general in its directions on the Scriptural Curriculum of Seminaries.

The local legislation concerning Scriptural Curricula in the Seminaries of the United States is, as is well known, contained in the decrees of the Plenary Councils of Baltimore, as far as these have not been set aside by subsequent legislation of Rome or by special privileges granted to individual institutions by the Holy See. The legislation of the Councils of Baltimore is, let it be noted, binding not only on diocesan Seminaries but also, unless special dispensation has been granted in particular cases, on all Seminaries, private or religious, preparing candidates for the priesthood.

The second part of the task assigned to me by the Program Committee is to give a "summary of the various ways in which this legislation is interpreted, as evidenced by the actual teaching of Scripture in our American Seminaries." It was suggested to me that the survey of actual Scriptural teaching in our Seminaries should be made as complete as possible. In order to have reliable data on which to build securely this desired summary, it has been necessary for me to send out a series of questions on the subject. These questionnaires have been sent to the Professors of Holy Scripture in all the ninety-two institutions listed as Major Seminaries in the Directory, recently published by the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Council. Some of the institutions listed in the Directory do not give

the complete six year course of a Higher Seminary, but are respectively the Houses of Philosophy or Theology of what is really one complete unit, and I have treated them as such; others, for instance at the Catholic University, are Religious Houses of Residence for students attending a complete Higher Seminary course outside.

In response to the questionnaires sent to these Major Seminaries of the United States, there have been received 85 replies. Of these replies, 29 have been received (out of a total of 32) from Seminaries educating students for the various dioceses of the United States; 56 from Higher Seminaries training candidates for Religious Orders and Congregations.*

The questions were confined to matters concerning the curriculum of studies and subjects of interest related thereto,—matters coming under obligatory ecclesiastical legislation of the Church authorities at Rome or of the Councils of Baltimore. In most cases full answers were given to the questions; but in other cases only incomplete data were supplied. I have based my calculations and conclusions upon the data submitted.

I. The first question concerning which information was sought, is: Whether the Scripture course extends throughout the *entire* course of six years of a Higher Seminary, prescribed by the Code of Canon Law. Leo XIII in the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* says: "Let our first care be to see that in Seminaries and academical institutions the study of Holy Scripture is placed on such a footing as its own importance and the circumstances of the time demand." Pius X in his Apostolic Letter *Quoniam in Re Biblica* decrees: "The curriculum of Biblical Studies is to be divided over the *entire* period during which ecclesiastical students pursue their course of Sacred Studies within the walls of the Seminary; so that when the course is finished, each student may have gone through the entire curriculum." (I do not quote the very precise legislation of *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* on the matter, as strictly speaking it does not bind the great mass of Seminaries in the United States, since they do not confer Pontifical degrees.) The legislation of the Third Council of Baltimore is very explicit on this point: "In omnibus igitur Semi-

* Replies were in addition received from four Higher Seminaries of Canada. The data contained in these are not included in the statistics of this paper, as Canadian Seminaries are not bound by the special legislation of the United States.

nariis Majoribus, tam provincialibus quam dioecesanis aut privatis, sive a sacerdotibus saecularibus sive a religiosis institutis regantur, studiorum curriculum non pauciores quam sex annos complectitur, quorum duo philosophicis disciplinis attribuendi, theologicis vero quatuor" (Canon 166). In the Curriculum, prepared by a committee of Bishops appointed by the Council, and submitted to the Hierarchy of the United States, classes on Scriptural subjects are appointed for each of the six years of study.

The legislation of the Church consequently requires that in each of the six years of the curriculum of the Higher Seminary there shall be instruction in Scriptural subjects. The answers to the first query of my questionnaire show that of 81 Major Seminaries of our country

31 have Scripture classes during 6 yrs. (Theology & Philosophy)
2 have Scripture classes during 5 1/2 yrs. (Theology & Philosophy)
8 have Scripture classes during 5 yrs. (Theology & Philosophy)
19 have Scripture classes during 4 yrs. (Theology)
6 have Scripture classes during 3 yrs. (Theology)
4 have Scripture classes during 2 yrs. (Theology)
11 have no classes in Scripture during 2 yrs. (Philosophy)

Comment: I have been requested to give as a third part of my paper an appreciation of the various ways in which the legislation of the Church is interpreted "as evidenced in the actual teaching in our American Seminaries." I prefer to let the facts speak for themselves and to content myself with these observations: 1) Since there is so much Scriptural matter to be imparted to our Seminarians, those responsible for our Scriptural curriculum should welcome the authority of ecclesiastical legislation, which requires the teaching of Sacred Scripture throughout the whole course of the Higher Seminary, namely during at least six years. 2) The years of the Philosophical course are included in the program specified for Scriptural teaching, and should gladly be taken advantage of to prepare the minds of the young Seminarians for the use of Sacred Scripture in their Theological course.

II. "Care must be taken," says Leo XIII in *Providentissimus Deus*, "that beginners approach the study of the Bible well prepared and furnished." So, the second question is one which is concerned with a requirement demanded by the Third Council of Baltimore of all who are admitted to our Higher Seminaries. Aside from the import of the legislation of the Church, ex-

pressed in *Providentissimus Deus, Quoniam in Re Biblica,* and other papal documents, it is expressly stated by the legislation for the Seminaries of the United States that *no one* should be admitted to our Higher Seminaries, who cannot read *intelligently at least the New Testament in Greek.* For in Canon 147 of the Decrees of the Third Council of Baltimore it is commanded that in the Preparatory Seminary "Linguae Graecae quoque seriam dent operam quae sufficiat ut saltem Novum Testamentum graece exaratum legentes intelligant"; and in Canon 162, relating to Higher Seminaries, it is decreed: "In delectu alumnorum, qui in majus Seminarium admittendi sint, magna adhibenda erit sollertia in expendenda eorum vocatione, indole ac moribus; *nemini* pateat aditus quin studiorum curriculum pro seminariis minoribus praescriptum *integre* ac cum sufficienti successu absolverit." It is true that the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* and the Apostolic Letter *Quoniam in Re Biblica* speak of the necessity of the *more capable* students and of *those preparing for academical degrees* being obliged to acquire a knowledge of Biblical Greek, but it is clear that these Roman documents, like the Constitution *Deus Scientiarum Dominus* are speaking of a specialized knowledge of BIBLICAL Greek, as distinguished from what a student acquires at least of *Classical* Greek in a preparatory Seminary. In any case there can be no doubt that it is required by the Canon of the Council of Baltimore that no candidate ("nemini") for the priesthood be allowed to enter a Higher Seminary in the United States without a knowledge of the Greek language sufficient to enable him to read at least the New Testament intelligently. This certainly was the mind of the Bishops of the Third Council of Baltimore. This legislation does not expect us to teach in our Major Seminaries the *elements* of *Greek* to beginners.

a) And so I have asked as my first question in regard to this matter: "Is a knowledge of the Greek Language, sufficient to enable one to read the New Testament intelligently, required as a condition of entrance to your Higher Seminary?" In answer to this question 40 Seminaries answered in an absolute way: affirmatively; 6 answered: "yes, but not as a *conditio sine qua non*"; 32 answered: *no,* it is *not* required.

b) As there might be some doubt as to *how* many years of preparatory study of Greek should be required of the average applicant for admission to a Higher Seminary, I have next asked

the Rev. Scripture Professors of our country how many years of preparatory study of Greek are in their opinion necessary that the average seminarian be able to read the New Testament intelligently. The answers received are as follow:

One year 5	Three years 16	Four or five 2
Two years 6	Three or four 3	Five years 3
Two or Three 5	Four years 19	Six years 1

One professor suggests three to four years of Classical Greek and one of the κοινή or, as an alternative, three full years of the κοινή.

c) As it is in accordance with the mind of ecclesiastical authorities, revealed in the pronouncements and legislation of Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV, and Pius XI, that there should be a class in the *Greek of the New Testament* (for at least the more capable and for those studying for degrees), I have asked as a third detail in this matter: "Is there a special class concerning Biblical Greek in your Seminary? The answers are as follow: Yes, 35; Yes, in Preparatory school, 1; No, 32.

It is a source of satisfaction that, although a class of *Biblical* Greek is not obligatory except for Seminaries preparing students for degrees, so many of our Seminaries have such a course. As regards the *length* of the course and the number of classes weekly, the majority have the course for one year 1 or 2 times weekly, with classes generally of one hour duration.

d) In answer to the question, "In your judgment what is the best year in the course of studies for the class in the Greek of the New Testament?"—came these responses:

In preparatory seminary 11	In First and Second Philosophy 4
In Philosophy 15	In Second Philosophy 7
In First Philosophy 8	In Theology 8

III. A second preliminary knowledge which is necessary "in order that beginners approach the study of the Bible well prepared and furnished" is that of the original language of almost all the books of the Old Testament. The teaching of Hebrew, while not made obligatory for all Seminaries by the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus,* or by other Pontifical legislation, except in the case of those conferring degrees, is made obligatory for at least one year on all Seminaries in the *U. S.* by the clear legislation of the Third Council of Baltimore: "Quandoquidem *linguae Hebraicae* quaedam cognitio et peritia non parum confert ad sacrum exegesim pleniori et accuratiori ratione pertrac-

tandam, huic linguae addiscendae *unum saltem annum* Philosophiae postremum aut Theologiae primum impendere *omnes cogantur*" (Canon 171). The Committee of Bishops, appointed subsequently to formulate a curriculum of studies best adapted for the preparation of priests for parish work in the United States, declared *two* years to be desirable for the study of Hebrew in American Seminaries, namely, the first and second of the Philosophical course. The time therein appointed in the years of the Philosophical course seems to be most suitable, for indeed the first year of Theology seems to be too late a time to begin the study of Hebrew; the seminarians need a knowledge of the Hebrew language particularly in the year of Fundamental Dogma, when they are studying the precise meaning of the Messianic prophecies.

According to the responses to the third question of the questionnaire:

a) 40 American Seminaries make the study of Hebrew obligatory.
9 do not make the subject obligatory.
21 do not give a course in Hebrew.
4 make the subject obligatory only for degrees.

b) In what year is Hebrew taught in these Seminaries?

In First Philosophy 8	First and Second Theology 2
In Second Philosophy 10	Second Theology 2
In First and Second Philosophy 7	Third Theology 1
In Second and Third Philosophy 2	Philosophy 5
In First Theology 9	Elective year 4

c) Opinion concerning the *best time* for the class of Hebrew:

I Philosophy 4	In Philosophy course 21	II Theology 2
I & II Philosophy 2	I Theology 11	III Theology 1
II Philosophy 7	I & II Theology 3	Every yr. of course 1

The object of the class is not to train specialists, even though a future specialist may occasionally be in our ordinary seminary class, but to give enough knowledge to enable students to understand at least the difficulties in the Scriptures and the explanation of them by specialists. The Third Council of Baltimore renders such a class obligatory for at least one year.

IV. Instruction in the *History of the Old and of the New Testament* is made *obligatory* on all Seminaries by the Apostolic Letter of Pius X, *Quoniam in Re Biblica,* "The instruction in Sacred Scripture to be imparted in every Seminary should ....

embrace the History of both Testaments." I presume that this does not necessarily imply that there must be special classes for that purpose; but in practise, I think, such classes are found necessary for the accomplishment of the purpose of the legislation. Such classes, placed in the years of Philosophy, offer a good opportunity for requiring the Seminarians to become well acquainted with the actual texts of the historical books of the Bible. In connection with this subject, it will be possible to make the seminarian acquainted with the history of the period between the two Testaments, concerning which a knowledge is most important at the present day.

The data obtained through the questionnaire show the following:

26 Seminaries have a special class in O.T. & N.T. History.
5 Seminaries have a special class in O.T. History only.
40 Seminaries have no special class in O.T. & N.T. History.
3 Seminaries treat the subject in connection with other Scripture work.

V & VI. Special classes in Biblical Archeology and Biblical Geography are not made obligatory by ecclesiastical legislation, either universal or local to the United States, except in the case of Seminaries which enjoy the right of conferring academical degrees. But attention to these subjects is counselled for all Seminaries by the utterances of our recent Pontiffs, as e.g., Pius X, when he gives the directions to Professors in *Quoniam in Re Biblica,* No. 5: "With regard to the Old Testament, he (the Professor) will make use of the latest results of research in illustrating the history of the Hebrew people and their relations with other Oriental nations." This implies, I think, that the Professor, in treating the relationship of the Hebrews with other Oriental nations, will have regard also to the Religion of those nations compared with that of Israel. It is noteworthy, moreover, that in the curriculum, prepared by the Episcopal Committee after the Council of Baltimore, classes in these subjects are indicated for both the first and second year of Philosophy. It is praiseworthy that in 20 Seminaries of our Country special courses in Archeology occur. In 25 Seminaries the subjects of Archeology and Geography are treated in connection with the classes of Biblical History; in seven it is treated in connection with the classes of Introduction. Specific data according to responses received:

V a) 20 Seminaries have a special class in Biblical Archeology;
43 Seminaries are without such a course;
b) 25 Seminaries treat the subject in the class of Biblical History.

VI a) 11 Seminaries with a special class in Biblical Geography;
b) 25 Seminaries in which the subject is treated in the class of Biblical History;
c) 7 Seminaries in which the subject is treated in the class of Introduction.

Some attention to the Comparative History of Religions should be made, as this subject is at the present time even more important than Archeology itself. This subject can be connected up with Archeology of the Old Testament in particular.

(*To be continued*)

REV. EDWARD J. BYRNE.

SAINT MARK THE DISCIPLE OF SAINT PETER AND SAINT PAUL

I

Christian tradition has unanimously assigned our Second Gospel to the disciple spoken of in 1 Peter 5:13, "The church that is in Babylon [*so Rome is designated*], elected together with you, saluteth you, and so doth my son Mark." The earliest witness of this tradition is Papias, Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia, the author of five books called *Expositions of Oracles of the Lord,* fragments of which have been preserved by Eusebius in his *Ecclesiastical History:*

> And the Elder also said this: Mark, having become the interpreter of Peter, wrote down accurately everything that he remembered, without however recording in order (οὐ μέντοι τάξει) what was either said or done by Christ. For neither did he hear the Lord, nor did he follow Him; but afterwards, as I said, he attended Peter, who adapted his instructions to the needs of his hearers, but had no design of giving a connected account of the Lord's oracles (λογίων, or according to some MSS. λόγων). So then Mark made no mistake, while he thus wrote down some things as he remembered them; for he made it his only care not to omit anything that he had heard, or to set down any false statement therein.

In the same place, Eusebius preserves the Greek of St. Irenaeus' statement that Papias was a "hearer of John, a friend of Polycarp, an ancient man" (*Adv. Haer.* V. 33,4). Now St. Irenaeus himself was born about A.D. 135; one who was an ancient for him, a friend of his venerated old teacher St. Polycarp and a hearer of St. John the Apostle, must have belonged to a very early period indeed. This "ancient" does not give in his own name the information that Mark was the interpreter[1] of Peter;

[1] He seems to have been the "interpreter" of St. Peter in the sense that he helped the prince of the Apostles to put his Aramaic into Greek. Perhaps, he helped him, too, to address those who spoke only Latin. That the word rendered "interpreter" (ἑρμηνευτὴς) means translator is indicated in the fragment which Eusebius has placed after the notice about Mark; he says that Matthew wrote in the Hebrew language and everybody interpreted (ἡρμήνευσεν) as best he could. Henry Barclay Swete, in his *Gospel according to Mark,* 3rd ed. p. xxiv, says, "According to the usual meaning in later Greek the ἑρμηνευτὴς is the secretary or dragoman who translates his master's words into a foreign tongue." The LXX uses the word of the interpreter of Joseph and his brethren (Gen. 42:23.); St. Paul uses it of the one who translates the words of the person speaking in a strange language (1 Cor. 14:28).

but quotes "the Elder" to that effect. This testimony is very convincing, especially if we identify "the Elder" with John, the son of Zebedee, the Apostle and Evangelist. And so we should. This identity has been proved over and over again; but never so convincingly as by the late Dom John Chapman, O.S.B., in his little book called *John the Presbyter* (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1911).

St. Irenaeus himself says, "Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, has delivered to us in writing the things which had been preached by Peter" (*Adv. Haer.*, iii. 1). Tertullian, a younger contemporary of St. Irenaeus, says, "The Gospel published by Mark may be called Peter's, whose interpreter he was" (*Adv. Marcion.* iv. 5). And Origen says, "Mark wrote it as Peter directed him" (in Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 25). His master, Clement of Alexandria, tells us the Gospel was written at Rome in accordance with the request of the Christians of that city: "The Gospel according to Mark was undertaken in the following way: Peter was preaching the word publicly at Rome and setting forth the Gospel under the action of the Spirit; those who assisted at his sermons (they were numerous) exhorted Mark, who had long attended upon Peter and remembered the things he said, to consign them to writing. He did so and gave the Gospel to those who asked for it. Peter having heard this did nothing by his counsels to hinder or encourage" (in Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 14).

St. Justin Martyr quotes a passage of St. Mark as coming from the "Memoirs of Peter" (*Dial.* 106).

Is there anything in the Second Gospel itself to show that its author was connected with St. Peter and otherwise to confirm the early tradition that it was written by St. Mark? It is held by very able literary critics of all schools of theology that there is, that internal evidence is quite in accord with external evidence in attributing the Gospel to St. Mark the Disciple of St. Peter.

There are many indications of influence of St. Peter. Adolph Jülicher enumerates some of them in his *Introduction to the New Testament* (p. 319): "There is no doubt," he says, "that Peter is especially prominent in this Gospel. The public ministry of Jesus begins with the calling of Peter (1:16-18); and the healing of his wife's mother (1:30 ff) is surely mentioned only because of his own grateful remembrance of the incident. Exactly at the right point in the narrative Mark brings about the distinction between the two names Simon and Peter (3:16); later

on (10:28; 11:21) a saying is put into the mouth of Peter (Matthew attributes it to 'the disciples') which could perfectly well have been said by any other follower. Still more striking is the way in which *Peter* is expressly named beside 'His disciples' in 16:7 as the recipient of the command to go before into Galilee, where the risen Lord would show himself."

It presented itself, however, as a difficulty to Eusebius that the figure of Peter does not loom large in the Second Gospel. The three principal texts concerning the primacy of Peter are in the other three Gospels (Mt. 16:17-19; Lk. 22:32; Jn. 21:15-17); the story of Peter's walking on the water and of the stater in the fish's mouth are in Matthew only (Mt. 14:24-33; 17:23-26). On the other hand, Mark, who omits our Lord's words of commendation on Peter's faith and the promise of the primacy, records the words of rebuke: "Get thee behind me Satan," addressed to Peter when he protested against the idea of Jesus' being crucified (Mt. 8:33); and the only long paragraph which he devotes to Peter is a detailed account of his three-fold denial of the Master (Mark 14:53 ff.). But this very fact that important matters, redounding to Peter's credit, are passed over in silence, while what is to his discredit is set forth at length may be explained, as Eusebius suggested, by Peter's humility;[2] and, on the whole, it rather confirms the traditional view as to the chief source of St. Mark's information.

The narrative itself is written in a way that fits in with the information we derive from tradition. Not only are the events described events which Peter must have witnessed, but they are told as an eyewitness would tell them.[3] Father Lagrange writes on this point: "The graphic touches of this Gospel are such as most naturally reflect the first impressions of those who were present when the events occurred. It is, indeed, possible for an able writer to see with the imagination more vividly and realistically than others see with their eyes and consequently to give a life-like account of imaginary events, while the narrative of an eye-witness may fail to convey any definite impression of what took place. But Mark had not sufficient literary ability to pass off his invention for reality by clever writing. He makes his reader assist at the scenes he describes because their details

[2] *Demonstratio Evangelica*, iii. 3, quoted by Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, p. lxii.

[3] Cf. C. H. Turner, in J. T. S., XVI (April, 1925), pp. 225. ff.

are drawn according to nature.[4] He does not claim to be an eye-witness, but he speaks so often of Peter that he indicates him as the source of information. We are then in contact with the testimony of the faithful friend of Jesus."[5]

The writer, at any rate, must have been a Palestinian. The Gospel does not, indeed, inflict upon us a wearisome description of Palestine, nor a history of the Roman Empire and its relations with the complicated little governments of Judaea in the time of Christ; but with all the knowledge furnished by history and by travel in the Bible lands, no one has been able to find the author at fault in any of his very numerous references to places, persons, customs, parties, etc. He is at home in Palestine and more particularly in Jerusalem; and he nowhere says anything that is contradicted by Roman jurisprudence and archeology.[6]

The tradition that St. Mark wrote for Romans, first found in Clement of Alexandria, finds some confirmation in the fact that there are more Latinisms in it than in any other book of the New Testament. Such are the words πραιτώριον (pretorium), λεγιών (legion), κῆνσος (tribute), καῖσαρ (Caesar, emperor), φραγελλόω (scourge), μόδιος (measure), δηνάριον (denarius), κοδράντης (quadrans), κεντυρίων (centurion), σπεκουλάτωρ (executioner), ξέστης (pitcher). Mk. 15:39 has the Latin κεντυρίων (centurion), while Matthew and Luke use the Greek word ἑκατοντάρχος. The Evangelist in 12:42 gives the Latin equivalent of Greek coins. That, at any rate, his readers were not Jews is sufficiently shown by such an explanation of Jewish customs as he gives in the beginning of chapter 7 concerning the washing of the hands.

The writer's familiarity with Aramaic, the language spoken by Palestinian Jews, is indicated by several quotations of the words of our Lord in Aramaic; and even apart from quotations, it is a "known result of criticism that Mark's language is, in part at least, Aramaic."[7] He usually co-ordinates clauses in the Semitic way by means of the conjunction *and*, and only a sparing use of the idiomatic particles and οὖν, ἄρα, μένδέ. Moreover he has a number of harsh, obscure, and unusual words, and in

[4] See, v.g., the account of the calming of the storm, 4:35-40, and compare it with the parallel account of Lk. 8:22-45.

[5] Lagrange, *The Meaning of Christianity according to Luther and his followers in Germany*, English translation, pp. 251-253.

[6] See v.g., Lagrange, *St. Marc*, pp. cxxiv. f.

[7] Rendel Harris, *The Prologue of St. John's Gospel*, p. 8.

general a vernacular Greek which is "possible" but unidiomatic.[8]

The detailed comparison of St. Mark with St. Matthew and St. Luke confirms the traditional view that he had detailed information about the episodes of our Lord's life which he did not acquire from either or both of the other synoptists. Moreover, that his fuller narratives are not the result of a combination of their accounts with details learned elsewhere, is a safe inference from the vividness, freshness, and realism which characterizes his writing. From a purely literary point of view, an oral source such as that of which history informs us, is a much more satisfactory explanation than written documents alone, or writings combined with special oral tradition. I cannot see that Dom Chapman has given any good reason to depart from this common view of literary critics in his posthumous work on *Matthew, Mark and Luke* which was reviewed in the first number of our Quarterly.

H. B. Swete in *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (pp. lxiv-lxv), says on the question of the sources of St. Mark:

> The internal evidence does not amount to a proof of Petrine origination. But it is entirely consistent with the tradition which represents Mark as especially indebted to St. Peter; and the tradition is at once too early and too widespread to be abandoned unless the Gospel itself renders its acceptance impossible.

This learned commentator judges the external evidence of dependence on St. Peter in accord with the internal evidence. He does not think, however, that St. Peter was the exclusive source of the Evangelist's information, especially in the narrative of the Passion: "Allowance must probably be made," he says, "especially in the last six chapters, for the use of other authorities, some perhaps documentary, which had been familiar to the Evangelist before he left the Holy City."

Speaking of St. Mark's relation to the other synoptists the same author says:

> It would appear that the relation of St. Mark to the other Synoptists is that of an early but fragmentary record towards records of a somewhat later origin and more complex character. In compass St. Mark falls far short of the other two but he excels them in approximation to chronological order and in life-like representation of the facts. His narrative moves in a more contracted field; he reports but one of Our Lord's longer discourses in full, and comparatively few of His sayings and parables. But where the three Synoptists are on common ground, St. Mark is usually distinguished by signs of the minuter

[8] Moulton, *Prolegomena*, p. 76.

knowledge which comes from personal observation or from personal contact with an eye-witness (p. lxxv).

An instance of the minuter knowledge, which is in this case inner knowledge, may be found in what St. Mark tells us of the Twelve. His Gospel has been called the "disciple Gospel" on account of the prominence he gives to the Apostles and to the intimate information he gives about them. The late C. H. Turner says on this point, in the *Journal of Theological Studies* for April, 1925, pp. 225 ff.:

> The natural and obvious conclusion is that we have before us the experience of a disciple and Apostle who tells the story from the point of view of an eyewitness and companion, who puts himself in the same group as the Master, who distinguishes the group of companions from the crowd at large. Matthew and Luke are historians who stand away from the events, and concentrate their narrative on the Central figure.... and on occasion the disciples and the crowd almost melt—as they never do in Mark—into one.

II

Most of the modern commentators of St. Mark, for instance Swete and Lagrange, identify Mark the Evangelist with the John Mark of Acts and with the Mark spoken of in the Epistles of St. Paul.[9] The notices concerning "Mark" are connected together by personal links (Peter, Paul, and Barnabas) and since they were all written in the same decade it is thought that they should be understood to refer to the same person, a well-known Christian surnamed Mark. If there were two prominent Christians of the name we should look for an indication of the fact in our texts.

The testimony of tradition, however, is not absolutely clear. Its earliest witnesses, Papias, St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, and Eusebius, speak of Mark the Evangelist as the disciple of Peter without referring to any connection with Paul. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (4th century) is the first document to couple the name of the Evangelist with that of the Apostle of the Gentiles.[10] Saint Jerome expressed the *opinion* that John Mark, the fellow-laborer of Paul, was the Evangelist.[11] Apparently subsequent ancient writers take it for granted that he was. Thus in the VI century in Cyprus, where the memory of St. Barnabas

[9] Acts 12:12,25; 13:5,13; 15:37-39; Col. 4:10; Phil. 24; 2 Tim. 4:11.

[10] See H. B. Swete, *St. Mark in Early Tradition, Expositor*, 5th Series, VI, 273.

[11] Comm. on the Eph. ad finem, quoted by *Acta Sanctorum*, XLVII, 356.

was specially cherished, as that of the founder of the Church of the island, Alexander the Monk regards Mark the Evangelist, the interpreter of Peter, as the Mark who accompanied Barnabas and Paul during their first missionary journey, and as the Mark of whom St. Paul speaks as a useful assistant, during his last sojourn at Rome.[12]

The more modern Greek view as reflected in the *Menaia* (corresponding to the Latin Breviary's second nocturns), followed by Baronius in the Roman Martyrology and after him by Tillemont in his Mémoires, distinguish "Mark the Evangelist and the Apostle of Egypt," whose feast we observe April 25, from "John Mark, disciple and cousin of Barnabas," whose feast is set for Sept. 27.[13] The *Acta Sanctorum* for Sept. 27 assert that no ancient author of any value makes such a distinction; and express the opinion that Baronius and Tillemont have given no good authority or argument for their departure from the oldest tradition of the West and what seems to be the earliest tradition of the East.[14]

The fact that Mark, the interpreter of Peter, was not, as far as we know, identified with St. Paul's follower until the IV century, must inspire some reserve; but Scripture makes it almost certain that there was only one Mark among the helpers of the Apostles and that he gave his services to both Peter and Paul.

That St. Mark, the disciple of St. Peter, was also in all likelihood a disciple of St. Paul would have been inconceivable to the scholars of the Tübingen School who fancied there was a sharp division between partisans of Peter and partisans of Paul, the Petrine and Pauline parties. But it has long been realized, even by the Scriptural descendents of Christian Baur, that the witness of the Apostles was not divided; none will be surprised that Mark is found assisting first Peter and then Paul. But one must rely on external evidence alone to prove that St. Mark was a follower of the Apostle of the Gentiles.

There is no clear internal evidence that St. Paul influenced the Second Gospel though Professor Bacon, of Yale, with M. Loisy and many others, is sure that a book which carries back into the Galilean ministry "Paul's redemptive doctrine" is the work of

[12] *Acta Sanctorum* 431 fol. xxii.

[13] "Bibli in Phoenicia S. Marci episcopi, qui et Joannes a beato Luca nominatur." *Martyrologium Romanum.*

[14] *Acta Sanctorum* XI, 354 f.

a militant Paulist with a tradition completely transformed from what it was on the lips of Peter and the other disciples of Jesus. The hypothesis that the Pauline redemptive doctrine is the cause rather than the effect of the teaching which St. Mark places on the lips of Jesus is absolutely gratuitous. Nor is there anything else in the Second Gospel that is distinctly Pauline; as a whole it certainly represents teaching less developed than that of St. Paul.

Beyond the fact that St. Mark was the interpreter of St. Peter and very likely a fellow worker of St. Paul "useful in the ministry," not very much is known about him. His name is not one that the writer of an apocryphal work would have chosen to give weight to his elucubrations. One interesting, though not very important, detail given about him has been preserved by St. Hippolytus (*Philos.* vii. 30). He is termed ὁ κολβοδάκτυλος (the "stump-fingered" or "stump-thumbed"). This is perhaps to be explained by the statement of the *Monarchian Prologues* (*Texte und Untersuchungen,* xv. 1 (1896) 10), that Mark was a Levite and cut off his thumb in order to escape service in the temple.

There is a tradition recorded by Eusebius that St. Mark labored in Egypt: *"They say* that the same Mark (the Evangelist) was first sent to Egypt and that he preached there the Gospel which he had written, and that he first established churches in Alexandria itself." These words of Eusebius (*H.E.* ii, 16), which are the earliest we have on the subject (neither Clement nor Origen refer to the matter) seem to express some uncertainty; but the reserve of Eusebius may bear, not on the mission of Mark to Egypt, but on some other point concerning the very obscure beginnings of the Church of that country. He may have suspected, for instance, that Christianity had been introduced into Alexandria before the advent of Mark. He does not seem to doubt that St. Mark labored in Egypt since in two other passages of his writings he begins the episcopal lists with the name of Mark, without any reserve; moreover, he states that Annianus succeeded Mark in the eighth year of Nero (61-62).[15] St. Jerome, St. Epiphanius, and the *Apostolic Constitutions*[16] accept the tradition without question.[17]

[15] *Ib.* Ch. 24 and in his *Chronicle* (P. G. XIX, 143).

[16] vii, 45. (Tixeront, *Handbook of Patrology,* p. 213).

[17] The tradition about the apostolate of St. Mark in Aquileia (*Acta Sanctorum* XII, 349, ff.) is not well attested.

St. Jerome, who otherwise reproduces Eusebius' statement about St. Mark in Egypt, says that Mark died in the eighth year of Nero (61-62); this cannot be true if the Evangelist is the Mark who was with Peter and Paul in their last years. But St. Jerome was probably mistaken about this point. Very likely he thought that Eusebius meant that St. Mark died the year Annianus succeeded him. It may well be that St. Mark, who went to Cyprus with St. Barnabas in A.D. 50, went from there to Egypt and afterwards rejoined St. Peter and St. Paul.

Tradition, however, in St. Jerome's time had it that St. Mark died in Egypt. The Pascal Chronicle says he died a martyr.[18] The Acts of St. Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, also say that he died a martyr and speak of the veneration of his tomb near that city;[19] and Palladius, a very trustworthy author, who wrote in his old age c. 420, tells us that the Galatian priest Philormus made a pilgrimage to the martyr's tomb (*μαρτύριον*) of Mark at Alexandria before going to Rome to that of Peter. This pilgrimage is placed before the end of the fourth century.[20] St. Mark had a basilica at Alexandria.[21] The body of St. Mark is said to have been brought to Venice in 828.[22] One of the great churches of the world is there dedicated to his memory.

W. S. REILLY

[18] *Chron. Pasch.* p. 252.

[19] *Acta Sanctorum*, xii, 352. These acts of St. Peter are not very reliable; their date is uncertain.

[20] *Historia Lausiaca*, Ch. 45, in the edition of Hemmer-Lejay, p. 305.

[21] Delahaye, *Cultes des Martyrs*, pp. 253-254.

[22] *Acta Sanctorum*, xii, 352. ff.

THE SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN OF ISRAEL'S RELIGION

It is a fact acknowledged by scholars of all schools of thought that the contribution of Israel to civilization was monotheism. All will admit that the religious concepts of the Israelitic nation transcended the pathetically erroneous expressions of religion of the world about her. When the causes of this transcendence are sought, however, the general consent gives way to diversity of opinion.

The present discussion is restricted to the religion of Israel during the patriarchal period, that is, the period that begins with Abraham and extends to the Mosaic period.

Research in the history of religions is undoubtedly supposed to be objective. We must observe nevertheless that the philosophical outlook of the scholar does usually influence his research, and also the ultimate results of that research. The modern rationalist presupposes the impossibility of an objective revelation to man. He uses the word "revelation" however, and it is well to understand what he means by it.

> Since revelation rightly understood is the coincidence of divinely guided events and minds divinely illuminated to interpret those events, and not the communication of infallible oracles, or particular doctrines or beliefs, it is reasonable to regard this intercourse of mind and event as the self-expression of the Creator.... there is no such thing as revealed truth. The truths of revelation are propositions which express the results of correct thinking concerning revelation, and these attain their fullness in the unveiling of a Person to a person. The marks of a true revelation are a union of holiness and power, before which the human spirit bows in awe and wonder, and which authenticates itself by continuous development to some focal point wherein all preparatory revelation finds fulfillment, and from which illumination radiates into every department of life and being.... Suffice it to say here, while the theory of a primeval revelation as an enunciation of particular theological dogmas vouchsafed to the human race as a whole, or to certain isolated individuals or groups, at the threshold of history, is untenable, the available evidence suggests a divine self-disclosure of God's nature and purpose which was certainly not confined to the Hebrew prophets.[1]

For this author, consequently, the research moves along natural lines and natural lines only, and the attempted explanations are based on purely natural principles. The Catholic scholar, however, admits the possibility of an objective revelation, the

[1] E. O. James, *The Old Testament in the Light of Anthropology* (London: 1935), p. 87f.

actual communication of truths by God to man by some physical or intellectual medium. Consequent upon and in virtue of this admission his research will differ from that of the Rationalist. The Catholic scholar admits not only the transcendence of the religion of Israel in its contents, but also in its origin. He asserts that since there is no natural cause sufficient to explain this unique fact in the history of mankind, we must recur to a cause above the natural order. Comparative study leads him to the conclusion that the fact is inexplicable from the natural viewpoint, and since it must have a sufficient cause, he admits the supernatural cause, the direct intervention of God as testified by the Bible. God is for him the cause, not in some remote indefinite way, but by a direct intervention in human affairs, by an immediate revelation of Person to person.

It is essential in this matter to establish with precision the state of the question. In speaking of the religion of Israel, it is necessary to distinguish the authentic religion from the popular religion. The authentic religion of Israel had its foundation in the person of Abraham, and was established by a divine revelation to him. It consisted essentially in the acknowledgment and worship of one God. Side by side with this authentic religion was the popular religion. The people were continually being drawn in a greater or less degree to false gods, and more especially to the corrupt moral practices of their contemporaries. This popular religion did not constitute what we would today term an apostasy. Israelites merely neglected their God in response to some need that the false gods would satisfy. They did not thereby deny their own God.[2] The pure ideals of the Israelitic religion were preserved due to personalities that were clearly distinguishable from the masses. In the period we are considering, they were the Patriarchs, comparable to the Prophets of later Israel. Furthermore, the religion of Israel admits of progressive development, (especially in the concept of the Divinity), not from error to truth, but from partial to complete truth. The original revelation was continually being increased by the addition of new truths, through revelations made to individuals in the course of history, such as Moses and the Prophets. This is observable, for example, in the revelations concerning the Messias and the

[2] Cf. J. M. T. Barton, *The Religion of Israel* (Studies in Comp. Rel.), vol. 3, p. 2.

Messianic kingdom. The concept became definitely more clarified by subsequent revelation.

The Catholic concept of the history of religion is in brief the following: God revealed Himself to the parents of the human race. This primeval revelation was preserved for a time, but men gradually deviated from the ways of righteousness, and the original revelation was obscured. The monotheistic idea was definitely obscured, if not completely lost, at the time of Abraham.[3] God chose Abraham and his seed as the custodians of the true faith, and as recipients of further revelations until the coming of Christ.

The Graf-Wellhausen School conceives the history of the Israelitic religion as follows: In the pre-Mosaic period the desert religion of the Arabian tribes, from which Israel descended, was its heritage. This was the religion of Animism, Fetishism, and Totemism.[4] This gradually gave way to Polytheism. It was Moses who led the people to Henotheism,[5] in that he caused them to worship the local god of Sinai, Yahweh, whom they conceived as a warrior, god of thunder, etc. The ethical, monotheistic concept of God came with the prophets. The accounts of Genesis that relate of the religion of the early Israelites are projections of later conditions into an earlier period. "From the patriarchal narratives it is impossible to obtain any historical information regarding the patriarchs; we can only learn something about the time in which the stories about them were first told by the Is-

[3] We do not overlook the fact established by ethnological research of the existence of the so-called "High Gods" among primitive peoples. It points to an original monotheism, but does not exclude polytheistic beliefs and practices.

[4] Animism—"the idea that some kind of personality or spirit is associated with or dwells in material objects, either living or non-living ones, and again, either temporarily or permanently. (This spirit may be regarded as the Supreme Being or a subordinate one.)"

Fetishism—worship paid to certain inanimate objects, such as teeth, claws, feathers, etc., as being "the symbol representing the ancestral deities of households, communities and tribes." (These deities are inferior to the Supreme Being.)

Totemism—"The belief of certain peoples that their families and clans stand in a definite blood relationship to particular species of animals," and also in certain cases to plants. Often the tribe is supposed to have descended from the totem animal. Cf. E. C. Messenger (Stud. Comp. Rel.), Introduction, vol. 1, p. 6ff.

[5] Henotheism signifies the worship of one god on the part of a nation or tribe without denying the existence of other gods.

raelitic people. This later period with its essential and superficial characteristics was unintentionally projected back into hoary antiquity, and is reflected there like a transfigured mirage."[6]

This theory is completely discredited today not only in the eyes of Catholics but of many non-Catholics. Such a concept could only have arisen when men were uninformed on the Ancient East. The knowledge that we possess today of Egypt, Babylonia, and South Arabia does not permit such crass notions of the religion of the period. Secondly, it was based upon the false methods of Comte, Spencer, Tylor, Frazer, and others, in the history of religions. "It was in fact no method at all, but a confused system based upon purely subjective estimations; and, moreover, it did not take into account the possibility of degeneration."[7] The scientific research of the German-Austrian School, based upon a comparative study of ethnology and prehistory, has presented us with a totally different picture.

> If we now glance back over the whole picture of man's oldest religion, as we have been able to draw it by means of the historical co-relation of ethnology and prehistory, we are immediately impressed by the strong contrast between our findings on the one hand and the *a priori* theorizings of the old progressive evolutionists on the other. The development of religion must have started from inferior beginnings, it was affirmed; but moral monotheism appeared to them as an intrinsically high form of religion, as indeed it is; therefore, the *a priori* argument ran, this could only be the final result of a long and complicated development, which finally produced monotheism in the latest times. In actual fact, however, it is just in the oldest stage of culture that we meet monotheism pure and simple, whereas, . . . it is precisely in the later cultural stages that monotheism recedes further and further before the onrush of naturism, animism, manism, and magicism.[8]

Although the rationalistic school has relinquished the evolutionary "method," they embrace practically the same conclusions arrived at by other methods. The ancestors of Israel were Semites, and consequently their religion was the same as that of their Semitic kinsmen. They had to be part of the cultural pattern in religion as well as in other things. "Like the rest of

[6] Prolegomena to the History of Israel, Engl. tr. 1885, pp. 318f. Quoted by Barton l. c.

[7] W. Schmidt, *The Religion of Earliest Man* (Stud. Comp. Rel.), vol. 1, p. 3.

[8] *Ibid.* p. 25.

their stock they regarded themselves as surrounded with beneficent and malevolent powers, capable of taking up their abode in natural objects, and assuming various forms. Hence the cult of stones, wells, and demons. They revealed the same fundamental attitude to the dead: a mingled fear and reverence which found expression in protective rites and necromantic traffic with the spirits of the underworld."[9]

They conceive the religion of pre-Mosaic Israel as less "inferior," "barbarous," "bestial" than does the Wellhausian School, but it is still polytheistic[10] or polydemonistic, and accompanied by animistic observances,[11] or ancestor worship.[12] According to them there are vestiges of the pre-Mosaic religion still to be observed in the Bible, although they have been given a monotheistic turn by a skillful adjuster of a later period. Therefore the arbitrary literary norm serves as support for the preconceived picture of patriarchal religion.

The religion of Israel had its beginnings in Abraham, and it consisted in the worship of the one true God as Lord of all. The religion of Israel from Abraham onward was monotheistic in the fullest sense of the word. This fact cannot be explained by natural causes. It is unique in the history of mankind. That a people of such meagre cultural status as these wandering Aramaeans could naturally arrive at the pure concepts of monotheism, when the entire world about them was polytheistic, is inconceivable. Such a unique fact considered in its proper historical context admits of one rational explanation, and that is in the immediate influence of God. It was definitely not borrowed from the contemporary civilizations, since monotheism was not known among them. It was not the result of philosophical speculation. That did not exist among the Hebrews. Renan's assertion, that the desert was the home of monotheism, and that the Semitic

[9] James, l. c. p. 81.

[10] "Ein krasser Polytheismus scheint es keinesfalls gewesen zu sein, wenn auch eine Mehrheit von Goettern deutlich bezeugt ist.... ein relativ hoeheren dem Monatheismus sich annaehernden Form des Heidentums....." Cf. R. Kittel, Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 7th ed., Stuttgart, 1932, vol. I, p. 258.

[11] "From the evidence produced in the last lecture it is clear that an animistic polydemonism constituted the background of the religion of the nomad Hebrews." James, l. c. p. 83.

[12] "Perhaps the most plausible conjecture is that some of the tribes, possibly all, worshipped their own eponymous ancestors." T. H. Robinson, *A History of Israel*, Vol. I, Oxford, 1932, p. 90.

peoples had a tendency to it, is rejected today. To seek an explanation in a certain aptitude of the nomadic desert tribes is neither sustained by the Bible nor history. As Père Lagrange has asserted, "There is at least one conclusion to which nobody at the present day can refuse his assent, namely, that the Semitic religions like the others, were polytheistic religions."[13] As the Bible continually points out, the tendencies of the masses after the occupation of the Promised Land were anything but monotheistic. They were inclined to consider Yahweh as the Chanaanites consider their Baals, and to associate with Yahweh all kinds of divinities.[14] The monotheistic minority strove continually to draw the people from these crass tendencies, and God raised up among them great reformers, who decried the errors of the masses. This special function of individuals is a characteristic of the religion of Israel not observed in others.

The Critical School seeks confirmation of its theoretical reconstruction of the religion of the Patriarchal period in the Source Theory. But the documents JEDP are unanimous in asserting that the Patriarchs worshipped one God. They are forced, therefore, to assert that the vestiges of polytheism have been covered up by the work of monotheistic scribes. But to the keen eye of the higher critic such indications are still discernible. They interpret the belief of the Patriarchs from the cult practiced by them. For example, they argue from the rite performed by Jacob at Bethel (cf. Gen. 28:18 f.) to an animistic belief on his part. They assert that he considered the spirit to dwell within the stone. But the conclusion by no means follows. In fact the text asserts the direct opposite, since Jacob declares that if God will be with him, and he return prosperously, the stone will be called the "House of God," i. e. he does not assert that it is the House of God here and now, but that it will be; he will erect here a sanctuary to God, which he did upon his return, as we see (cf. 35:7). The fact that similarities are observed between the ritualistic practices of the Hebrews and those of their polytheistic neighbors by no means proves identity of belief. The rite of circumcision was common to many peoples, but it is known that with many of them it was connected with the rites practiced when the male reached puberty, whereas the Israelites circumcised eight days after birth. Although the rite may be similar the

[13] Cf. Barton, *Semitic Religions* (Stud. Comp. Rel), vol. 2, p. 3.
[14] Cf. Dict. Apol. Art. Juif (Peuple) Touzard t. 2, col. 1612.

significance may differ. If in later times the Hebrews imitate certain rites of the Chanaanites, it does not follow that they borrowed their beliefs. It was part of the divine economy that in many of their ritual practices the Israelites should be children of their time. Was it not expedient? In the matter of belief they were children of God, and consequently above and beyond the children of men. It is not in interpreting the biblical text that the Rationalist finds support for his theories, but in doing violence to it.

The theophanies found in the Old Testament are a stumbling-block to the modern critics. God appears in human form; is the guest of Abraham (cf. Gen. 18). It is objected that we read of such relations between God and men in the myths of ancient peoples, and we dismiss them without further ado. *A pari* there is no reason to accept the stories of Genesis dealing with such things as true. One who denies the posibility of an intervention of God in the affairs of men, necessarily denies these revelations of God as unhistorical. But their viewpoint is precisely not historical but philosophical, that is, it does not depend upon a principle of historical criticism, but upon a philosophical attitude of mind. The denial of these facts results from their *Weltanschauung*. They speak of the tales of ancient peoples, but forget that the ancient peoples produced no such thing as prophecy, and no such thing as ethical monotheism. This was the religion of Israel alone, and that in a polytheistic environment and despite the propensities of the people for polytheism. To explain this it is absolutely necessary that Israel should possess religious experiences above and beyond those of her neighbors, experiences that came from God. If we are not content to reply *ignoramus*, we must accept the fact of God's entry upon the stage of the world, an immediate revelation. The manner in which this revelation is described is another question. We must not forget that the writer describes things naively, adapted to the capacity of his readers. Anthropomorphisms are abundant in this section of the Bible, but they are to be found throughout the entire Bible. Can we describe adequately today our concept of the divinity? The fact therefore stands to be accepted by all who are not impeded by their philosophical prejudices, that the supernatural religion of Israel had a supernatural origin.[15]

JOHN J. DOUGHERTY

[15] Cf. Heinisch, *Das Buch Genesis*, Bonn 1930. p. 81 f.

FATHER LAGRANGE ON JESUS AND HIS MESSAGE

The publication of an English translation of Père Lagrange's "*L'Évangile de Jésus-Christ*"[1] is a noteworthy event in the production of our Biblical literature. The many editions of the French original, which are being required to satisfy the demands of the French reading public, are in themselves a guarantee that the work has a message for the world at large. It is to be hoped that its message will be equally welcome in its English form.

As remarked by Archbishop Goodier shortly before his death in a laudatory article on this work of Père Lagrange, there are some authors so pre-eminently masters of their own subject that to review their books in the ordinary sense seems almost an impertinence. Such an author is Père Lagrange, whose death over a year ago, was an irreparable loss not only to Catholic scholarship but to the scholarship of the world. All that the present writer wishes to do is to make known to readers, unacquainted with the French original, some of the qualities of unusual merit in this work concerning our Divine Lord and His message.

Ordinarily these volumes would be classed as a Life of Christ, but their author prefers to entitle them: "The Gospel of Jesus Christ"; for in his opinion "the Gospels themselves are the only Life of Jesus Christ that can be written. Nothing remains for us but to understand them as best we can." In his labors to understand the Gospel records and to explain them for others P. Lagrange produced his voluminous commentaries on the texts of the Evangelists, "a monumental ensemble," as Père Grandmaison, S.J., has declared, "that marks a date in Catholic exegesis and of which it may be justly proud." But these mighty tomes by reason of their nature are intended particularly for specialists. The present work, now translated into English and published in two volumes, was composed purposely, as a synopsis of the commentaries, for those not trained in textual and historical criticism, even for those, the author ventures to hope, "who are engrossed in manual labor."

[1] The Gospel of Jesus Christ by Reverend M. J. Lagrange, O.P. Translated by members of the English Dominican Province. 2 Vols. xvii, 320 & 330 pp. 1939. London: Burns, Oates & Washbourne, 10 s. 6d. New York: Benziger, $3.00 per volume.

In his great commentaries the critical necessities of the times obliged P. Lagrange to be scrupulously careful not to explain one Gospel by another. But in order that the relationship of the texts of the Evangelists to each other might be more easily studied, and moreover that the manner in which the Gospel narratives may be satisfactorily combined to make a composite picture of the life and doctrine of Jesus might be more readily understood, he published a number of years ago in connection with his great commentaries a Synopsis of the Gospel texts in Greek. This latter work acts as the foundation of the present study, which, as the author modestly tells us, "is little more than a rapid commentary on the Synopsis along with a few historical observations."

In truth P. Lagrange throughout allows as far as possible the Evangelists to speak for themselves. It is only because there is continuous necessity of explanation of the combined Gospels that our author adds his comments. This is done in such a modest manner that at times almost without becoming aware of the fact the reader finds himself, as it were, reading the words of another Evangelist, who is keenly conscious of the needs of the modern mind with regard to his Divine Master.

While P. Lagrange strives in this work to make the Gospel texts ("the only Life of Jesus Christ," let it be remembered, "that can be written") intelligible even to those who have only these volumes at hand, nevertheless he plainly hopes that they will be read in connection with the Synopsis, either in its original Greek form or at least in the modern vernacular editions, which have been made from it. For underlying every effort to construct the Life of Jesus there is the necessity of putting together the detail of the Gospel history, following "the more or less certain, more or less probable, or merely conjectural order of events."

It is, according to P. Lagrange, St. Luke's order and generally St. John's chronology which ought to be made to serve as the basis of the Life of Jesus. Not that the order of St. Luke's Gospel is to be followed absolutely or even the chronology of St. John's Gospel, as handed down to us in the manuscript tradition. In connection with this matter P. Lagrange in the preface of this work sums up succinctly for the general reader the chief difficulties which arise in the utilization of the source material, and likewise the principles which he employs in solving them.

The public life of Jesus is judged to have lasted two years and some months, an opinion which seems to be becoming more and more commonly held. The framework, however, upon which the events of this period are reconstructed, is built differently by P. Lagrange than it is done by most authors. He, for instance, considers the fifth chapter of St. John's Gospel to have become accidentally displaced from its original position and to have been given its current place before the present manuscript tradition began. For various reasons, clearly set forth by P. Lagrange and (cf. *Revue Biblique*, 1926, p. 382 f.) by Fr. Olivieri, O.P., by whom the attention of P. Lagrange had been called to them, the fifth chapter is placed after the sixth. By so doing a number of difficulties in the reconstruction of the Life of Jesus are removed, the chief among them being the difficulty which results from the seemingly different representation of the attitude of Jesus concerning the revelation of His divinity, as presented by the Synoptic accounts and by St. John's Gospel respectively. As is well known by all Biblical scholars, Jesus according to the Synoptic tradition is narrated to have been reticent about the declaration of His divinity in the early part of His public life and to have actually imposed injunctions of silence upon those who had the beginnings of a recognition of His divine mission and personality and who were disposed to proclaim them; while on the other hand according to St. John's Gospel, chapter 5, Jesus, who had already spoken quite openly to Nicodemus and to others in private conversations, spoke so plainly in public at Jerusalem that the Jews, we are told by the Evangelist, wished all the more to kill Him because He not only broke the Sabbath but also called God His own Father, making Himself equal to God. These seemingly different representations of Jesus form, as is commonly known, one of the main details of the so-called Joannine problem. The placing of John 5 after John 6, for which there is the precedent of Tatian in the second century and of others in more recent times, in addition to other advantages removes this not inconsiderable difficulty in a satisfactory manner.

On the other hand the placing of the cleansing of the Temple only at the beginning of the public ministry of Jesus, where St. John's Gospel has it, and not also at the end, where the Synoptics have it, although accepted as most probable by so excellent a critic as Père Lebreton, S.J., is perhaps not so satisfactory and is not liable to be so well received. Most scholars prefer to hold

that there were two cleansings of the Temple by Jesus. (Cf. F. M. Braun, O.P., *Revue Biblique*, 1929, p. 178 f.)

It is impossible in a limited space to indicate the many points of excellence of this work of P. Lagrange. They exist on almost every page. Even as one reads the preface, one realizes that he is in contact with the work of a master of the subject. The manner in which the reader, as he goes along, finds himself placed in the geographical, chronological, and general historical setting of the life of Jesus and made to participate in the events of the Gospel history makes him feel that he is being informed by a modern Evangelist in the true sense of the term. The elucidations, for instance, of many contemporary allusions in a manner not given in many other Gospel studies make him realize that he is under the guidance of one who knows intimately the Jewish and the Pagan world into which Jesus came. What manuscripts and books and the science of archaeology could not teach P. Lagrange, a residence of more than 40 years in the changing East and above all a life of prayer and meditation have taught him.

The work, writes P. Lagrange at the conclusion of the preface, contains so little in the way of pious considerations that I hardly dare to say that its purpose is to make Our Lord Jesus Christ better known and loved. But on the other hand, may we not say that the god-like calm of the Evangelists is the best expression of the soul's wonder when brought face to face with the mystery of Redemption? Love comes afterwards when we meditate on the sacred text itself which is our light, our strength and our life. It is to this text that we must always come back.

It is precisely because P. Lagrange does not attempt to write a Life of Christ in the ordinary sense that this work on our Divine Lord and His doctrine is of a unique character. The author allows, as far as possible, the Gospel texts to speak for themselves; he does not needlessly interpose himself between the reader and the Evangelists who knew Jesus personally or who were in personal contact with those who did so; yet he adds, almost in the manner of an Evangelist himself, a synthesis of the very special knowledge which is the fruit of his labors on the sacred subject for over 60 years, labors which have gained for him the title of "Magister Magistrorum" (cf. Verbum Domini, 1937, p. 128).

Even the specialists may learn somewhat from these two volumes. The ordinary cleric who studies them will find them an almost inexhaustible source of knowledge and devotion.

EDWARD J. BYRNE.

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

III.

8. Psalm 16:9b-10a. (Monday, at Matins.)

Inimici mei animam meam circumdederunt,
adipem suum concluserunt.

The very common Hebrew noun for "fat" seems to derive from the name for "the diaphragm" or "midriff," as the part of the human body where obesity is most in evidence. This reminiscence of the organ itself seems to reappear in a few cases of metonymy or synecdoche, where "midriff" may answer for "heart." Here we may best understand "They have shut up their heart," or made their conscience obdurate.

9. Psalm 16:11. (Monday, at Matins.)

Projicientes me nunc circumdederunt me: *oculos suos statuerunt declinare in terram.*

This is difficult and much disputed, owing to the variable force of the Hebrew infinitive which follows *statuerunt.* It may express (a) *declinare* or *deflectere* as either transitive or intransitive, (b) *inclinare* again in either capacity, or (c) *tendere, extendere.* The commonest interpretation (Bo., Ni., Zo.) takes *declinare* as transitive and supposes a suppressed object *me,* thus rendering "They have stationed their eyes (diligently watched) to cast me down to the ground." Avoiding this insertion of *me,* Bi. would take *oculos suos* as the direct object of the infinitive in the meaning *extendere,* thus preferring "They have determined to stretch their eyes over the earth (in their persistent search for me)." This is certainly probable, but the former explanation seems to deal more naturally with the Hebrew verb, even if the object *me* must be supplied.

10. Psalm 16:13b-14a. (Monday, at Matins.)

Eripe animam meam ab impio, *frameam tuam* ab inimicis manus tuae.

The question is how "thy sword" can be identified with "my life." In the Hebrew we now read, "Rescue my life from the wicked, thy sword," and here the verse ends. *Ab inimicis manus tuae* begins the next sentence, where we shall see it presenting

its own difficulties. At least, "thy sword" seems certain. We may best suppose (with Jerome and Vigouroux) that it ends the sentence, and adopt Jerome's interpretation *Salva animam meam ab impio, qui est gladius tuus.* All will doubtless recall how frequently both Psalmists and Prophets remind us of the truth that the human persecutor is only an instrument which God can control at pleasure.

11. Psalm 16:14b. (Monday, at Matins.)

Domine, *a paucis de terra divide eos* in vita eorum.

Prefixing *ab inimicis manus tuae* as now belonging to this context, we have a really difficult passage. The text must be corrupt, since no version agrees with the Hebrew or with any other.

First, the Hebrew, instead of *ab inimicis,* gives us "from the men," but not "from the men of thy hand," since "men" is not in the construct or governing state. *Manus tua* seems clear, but not its construction. *Domine* is evident in "Yahweh."

A paucis stands for precisely the same Hebrew form as *ab inimicis*—"from the men" again. The LXX read it as one word, a causative participle of "to die," and rendered it "destroying," so that the Vulgate's *a paucis* is hard to account for. *De terra* stands for a Hebrew form which rather means *ab aevo,* either literally "from long ago," or, if construed as comparative, "over long." *Divide eos* with only a different vowel-pointing may well be the noun-phrase *divisio* (*portio, sors*) *eorum.* "Too long is their lot in life" is self-consistent and probably correct for *de terra divide eos in vita eorum.*

The following from Zo. comes as near as possible to explaining our extant text;

(13) *Eripe animam meam ab impio, gladio tuo,*
(14) *ab istis viris, dexterâ tuâ, Domine:*
A viris—nimis diuturna est pars eorum in vita.

This also leads naturally into what follows: the persecutors are prosperous enough. However, with the original text so uncertain, any explanation is but a makeshift.

12. Psalm 17:46. (Monday, at Matins.)

Filii alieni mentiti sunt mihi, filii alieni *inveterati sunt, et claudicaverunt a semitis suis.*

Recounting the triumphs which he owes to divine assistance, the royal singer has just promised himself the allegiance of peo-

ples hitherto independent of his sway. He now passes on to a class of less willing subjects.

The three verbs have all been changed by the LXX from the Hebrew future into past time, and all of them, with the noun rendered *semitis,* are also somewhat diverted from the particular meanings appropriate to this context. The Hebrew of *mentiti sunt mihi* is rather "will dissemble with me." *Inveterati sunt* strays further from "will wither" or "fade," though some trace of this meaning remains. *Claudicaverunt* just misses the peculiar implication of its original, for while the Hebrew verb occurs nowhere else, its cognates in other languages reveal the meaning "quake." This has a pregnant connection with *a semitis,* which is the most misinterpreted word in the whole passage; its radical meaning of "enclosure" squares best with the context when taken as "stronghold" or "fortress." In all this the Vulgate has rigorously followed the LXX.

The conqueror predicts that "the aliens [lit. 'sons of strangeness'] will dissemble with me; the aliens will faint, and come quaking out of their strongholds."

13. Psalm 20:12. (Monday, at Matins.)

Quoniam *declinaverunt in te mala:* cogitaverunt consilia quae non potuerunt stabilire.

As in passage 9 above, the verb rendered *declinare* is transitive. Its object in Hebrew is singular in number. Thus, translating "For they have stretched forth (attempted) evil against thee," we also grasp the force of the second member.

14. Psalm 21:2. (Friday, at Prime.)

Deus, Deus meus, respice in me: quare me dereliquisti? *longe a salute mea verba delictorum meorum.*

The LXX has read a Hebrew noun meaning "error" where the Massoretic text has a noun with the second and third radicals in the reverse order, meaning "clamoring." Which was originally right we cannot say, but at least the extant Hebrew saves the sense with "words of my clamoring." In *a salute mea,* immediately following *longe,* we may have again the comparative construction expressed by "from,"—"more remote than my deliverance" meaning "too far for my deliverance." This would give us "Why hast thou abandoned me? (and why) are the words of my clamoring too far (from thee) to deliver me?"

15. Psalm 21:3. (Friday, at Prime.)

Deus meus, clamabo per diem, et non exaudies: et nocte, *et non ad insipientiam mihi.*

The finite verbs of the Hebrew, imperfect in form, are actually present in time: "My God, I cry by day, and thou hearest not." In the obscure phrase which follows *et nocte,* the LXX's insertion of *ad* has no equivalent in the Hebrew. Finally, the latter has for *insipientia* a noun meaning "repose." Thus we have, simply enough, "And (I cry) by night, and there is no rest for me," or "I have no rest."

Zorell prefers an explanation already presented in the *Ecclesiastical Review,*[1] involving some correction of the text. To this he was inclined on the ground that the Hebrew negative here employed, and normally used to modify a finite verb, was inappropriate to a noun-clause. However, its use in the construction suggested above has been justified,[2] with this very passage cited as an instance in point.

16. Psalm 26:4. (Monday, at Terce.)

Unam petii a Domino, *hanc* requiram: ut inhabitem in domo Domini.

Too much literalism, beginning, as usual, with the LXX. Hebrew possesses distinct forms for the masculine and feminine genders, but none for the neuter. Hence, when "one thing" or "this thing" calls for emphasis on its impersonal nature, the feminine form is used so as at least to exclude the masculine. Genesis 2:23 affords a curious example in which the antecedent is actually feminine, but the pronouns designedly neuter in force: "This (thing) is at last bone from my bones and flesh from my flesh; this shall be called 'woman' because from 'man' this was taken." So here, *unam* merely serves for *unum,* and *hanc* for *hoc,* as the Psalmist goes on to show by specifying the desired boon.

17. Psalm 26:12b. (Monday, at Terce.)

Quoniam insurrexerunt in me testes iniqui, *et mentita est iniquitas sibi.*

Followed by the Vulgate, the LXX here presents something so different from our present Hebrew text that reconciliation

[1] LXXVI, 1, p. 103.

[2] Cowley's Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, §152 *d.*

seems impossible. Even Jerome, in his version from the Hebrew, clings to some expression for "falsehood" in the second member, which has no counterpart in the Hebrew now. The latter also lacks *sibi*. It reads, "There have arisen against me false witnesses and a blast of violence." If we wish to retain the Vulgate reading of this latter clause, its sense may be "Iniquity has proven false to itself," that is, has defeated its own purpose by exposing its falsehood.

18. Psalm 28:6. (Monday, at Lauds.)

Et comminuet eas tamquam vitulum Libani: *et dilectus quemadmodum filius unicornium.*

This tangled construction has resulted from a wrong division of the verse, of which the first member really ends with *vitulum*. "Lebanon" is not governed by the latter, but is a second direct object of the initial verb, the first one being *eas* (i e. the celebrated cedars). The picture is that of the havoc of lightning tearing the great trees apart so that their fragments fly in all directions. "And he made them leap like a calf!" Now, in this wild confusion, the mountain itself seems to leap. "Lebanon and Sirion" (the Sidonian name for Mount Hermon) are additional objects of "made to leap;" but "Sirion" was read by the LXX not as a proper name, but as meaning "beloved," whence the Vulgate's *dilectus*. These seem to leap about "like the young of wild oxen." Jerome's version (in Migne) comes very close to this interpretation of the Hebrew text of his own time:

Et disperget eas quasi vitulum:
Libanum et Sarion quasi filium rhinocerotum.

Of course, the "rhinoceros" is hardly more at home here than the "unicorn" itself, the Hebrew noun now being generally acknowledged to denote the wild ox of the region. The verse should read:

"And he made them leap like a calf,
Lebanon and Sirion like a young wild ox."

19. Psalm 28:9a. (Monday, at Lauds.)

Vox Domini *praeparantis cervos,* et revelabit condensa.

Jerome attests our Hebrew text in writing *Vox Domini obstetricans cervas et revelans saltus.* The vivid lightning-flash is still "the voice of Yahweh." The first verb, however, demands no more than "make to writhe in pain," although easily associat-

ed therefore with birth-pangs. The lightning terrifies the wild does to anguish, and illuminates the densest thickets.

(*To be continued.*)

W. H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

PSALM 4:9-10.

EDITOR:

I have read your exegetical notes on the Psalms with great interest, but am surprised that you did not explain the obscurities of Psalm 4:9-10 after elucidating Psalm 4:7-8. Do you not think that the words *in idipsum* ("the selfsame") and *singulariter* ("singularly") need explanation? You might have occasion to come back to this Psalm later.

PAROCHUS.

New Orleans, La.

The expressions indicated, while not uncommon, do fit a little awkwardly into their context here, and we acknowledge our oversight. The text runs:

(9) In pace *in idipsum* dormiam et requiescam,
(10) quoniam tu, Domine, *singulariter*
in spe constituisti me.

The two verses are numbered as one in the Hebrew, whose order of words is closely followed. *In idipsum* is here, as often, an adverbial phrase, and not so much "the same" as "together" (cf. Ps. 33:4; 73:6; 121:3). Modifying both verbs, it serves to make their actions simultaneous: "I will at once (both) lie down and rest," (without a sleepless interval due to anxiety). For the first verb does not mean "sleep" in the Hebrew, but merely "lie down."

Singulariter is "alone," and is again adverbial if taken to modify "thou dost settle me" or "make me dwell;" i. e. I need no attendants for safety's sake. Or it may be the adjective "alone" with the Divine Name: "For thou, Yahweh, alone makest me dwell in security."

W. H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.

EXEGETICAL NOTES

TITLES IN MT. 23:8-12

A priest from Alabama who has recently been having arguments with the Witnesses of Jehovah, "Judge" Rutherford's followers, says that the charge which is being made most frequently against Catholics is that in at least one clear case they are showing absolute disregard for Our Lord's words: "But be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren. And call no man father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted" (Mt. 23:8-12, according to the Authorized Version).

Now the Catholics make some of their priests "doctors," a title which is equivalent to "teacher" or "master" (in Hebrew "Rabbi") as is clear from the Greek word which corresponds to these three words, διδάσκαλος; and "father," which is here practically equivalent to "master," is the ordinary title for priests in this country. Are not Catholics, then, ignoring Christ's commandment, or counsel, or whatever it may be? I put the question to a seminarian the other day and he answered without disturbance or hesitation: "We Catholics are talking about 'fathers in Christ' and our Lord has no objection to that."

The great Jesuit scholars, the late Father Prat and the still living Father Lebreton, did not find the question and answer so simple: both of them in their "lives of Christ" say that Our Lord wanted his words to be taken literally—by the Apostles. They were to refrain from the title "master" and "father" till after the hierarchy was instituted in His Church! The late Father Lagrange, O.P., gives the interpretation of our seminarian and regards it as the meaning of the Lord's words from the beginning. He says in his *Gospel of Jesus Christ* which Dr. Byrne praises so warmly in this issue of our Quarterly:

"But you," says Jesus, addressing His Apostles, "have only one Father, Him who is in heaven, only one Master who is the Christ."

Have we then forgotten this advice, or counsel, or behest? One would think so if he judged by appearances. But it is always the inner man that Our Lord wants to get at. What men say matters little. What would be wrong would be to love and seek these titles as something due to oneself and to ascribe to oneself the reality they stand for. But what father of souls, be he a lowly catechist or a great pulpit orator, is not conscious that he speaks in the name of Christ alone, and that he has no other spiritual paternity than that which comes from God? The Pharisees were self-com-

placent about this homage; in this they were wrong, and the disciples of Christ who should have the same sentiments would be still more guilty after this charitable warning.

If a Christian worthy of the name, one who practices humility, accepts the title Father or Master it is simply because those who give it to him look upon him as a father in God and authorized to teach Christian doctrine. Such is the mind of Christ as we may interpret it by the mind of the Church. That St. Paul so interpreted the mind of Christ and the Church is indicated by his statement to the Corinthians: "If you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers. For in Christ Jesus, by the Gospel, I have begotten you" (1 Cor. 4:15). If there had been a Puritan around to ask him if he were not tempting the Corinthians to break Our Lord's rule by making them look upon him as a father, he would have said that in claiming fatherhood in God he was true to the mind of Christ and to the real meaning of His words to His disciples. Jesus had warned them against pride in the matter of titles, but had not condemned the use of titles in the case of his disciples any more than he had in the case of the scribes.

We should remember, to come back to the title "Father," usually given to priests, that Catholics use it in the sense of "Father in Christ" and that non-Catholics give it to us simply through courtesy. It is better not to insist on the title if one is dealing with persons who have scruples in the matter: let them call us "Mister"—without telling them that "Mister" is a corruption of "Master."

WENDEL S. REILLY

THE UNJUST STEWARD (Lk. 16:1-9)

The Gospel narrative for the Eighth Sunday after Pentecost has been regarded by many as one of the most difficult passages in Sacred Scripture. St. Luke alone mentions the parable of the Unjust Steward. But, in the light of the context its meaning is clear. By it our Lord intended to illustrate the proper use of wealth. The purpose of the parable is clearly set forth in the often misinterpreted verse nine: "And I say to you: make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail they may receive you into everlasting dwellings."

The actual circumstances under which the parable was spoken, are not mentioned by St. Luke. The time is uncertain, but it probably pertains to the last period of our Lord's public ministry.

In the introduction, our Lord addresses himself primarily "to his disciples." The expression, however, included not only his Apostles, but his followers in general. Moreover, since the parable followed im-

mediately that of the Prodigal Son (15:11-32), the publicans and sinners there mentioned, as well as the scribes and Pharisees referred to in verse fourteen of this chapter, all formed a part of his audience.

The image used by our Lord was well known to the people: "There was a certain rich man who had a steward; and the same was accused unto him that he had wasted his goods." In ancient times it was quite common for a rich man to entrust his goods to a steward, who managed and dispensed with his master's property as he saw fit. As sometimes happens, the steward wasted his master's goods just as the Prodigal Son had wasted his substance (Lk. 15:13). The rich man, however, learned about the fraud, and demanded that an account be taken. The steward was accused (διαβλήθη) either falsely or out of malice and jealousy. At any rate, he implicitly admitted his guilt (16:3); for he took measures to provide for himself when he would be dismissed.

Two alternatives were open to him, manual labor or begging. He realized, however, that he was unfit for the former, and too proud for the latter. Besides he had little hope of obtaining a similar position, for no one would trust him in his degradation. So he decided upon a certain plan of action, whereby he might provide for himself: "I know what I will do, that when I shall be removed from the stewardship they may receive me into their houses" (v. 4). His scheme probably included the very ones who had accused him. However, it only provides for the immediate future; for the steward did not propose to assume permanent residence in other people's houses.

In order to carry out his plan, he meets the debtors one by one. In the narrative only two are mentioned, but all probably took advantage of the concession. The steward already had the bills prepared. No time was allowed for reflection: for the debtor was told to take his bill and sit down quickly. Again the wisdom or knavery of the steward is apparent. All the debts were not equally reduced: the one was reduced by one-half, the other, by one-fifth. He realized that it was better to have variety than uniformity: for besides benefiting his debtors, he also had to consider himself and see to it that, externally at least, he was justified before his master.

The rich man, however, learned of his steward's latest knavery; though he disliked the action, he was forced to admire the method employed: "And the lord commended the unjust steward, forasmuch as he had done wisely: for the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light" (v. 8). Some exegetes wrongly imagine that Christ is "the Lord" in this verse. But this is entirely foreign to the context; and verse nine distinguishes very clearly between the comment of the rich man and that of our Lord. The former praised his servant not for his iniquity, but his prudence: however bad, he provided for the future. It is precisely this prudence of the

steward that Christ holds up for imitation. "For the children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light," that is, worldly people are wiser and more prudent in their transactions with one another, than spiritual-minded persons are in providing for their eternal welfare. In commenting on this text, St. Augustine says: "If this steward could so wisely provide for this life, much more ought we to be solicitous for the life to come.... If this steward, unjust as he proved himself to be, was praised for his wisdom, much more shall we receive praise of God, if by our almsgiving we injure none, but benefit many. If a wrongdoer received praise from his lord, how much more pleasing are they to the Lord God, who do all in accordance with his will" (Lib. ii, *de Genesi*).

The last verse of the parable states what verse eight implies, namely, that prudence must be manifested in making friends: "And I say to you: make unto you friends of the mammon of iniquity, that when you shall fail they may receive you into everlasting dwellings." Our Lord does not say who such friends may be, but undoubtedly he means the poor. This is also evident from the following parable of Dives and Lazarus (16:19-31). Alms given to the poor will be a means of attaining heaven. According to others, such friends are the Angels who befriend those who aid the poor, and so bring the benefactors to heaven. In either case the end is the same: the prudent and proper use of wealth can be of great service in attaining everlasting happiness. The more exact reading of the text is probably "when it shall fail" (ἐκλίπῃ), and not, "when you shall fail."

The expression "mammon of iniquity" has perplexed the minds of many. As such it has no parallel in Sacred Scripture, although it is mentioned in the Targums and the apocryphal book of Henoch 63:10. It is commonly taken to be a Semitic word of uncertain origin, meaning wealth or money. As such it stands for "unjust mammon," the Hebrew tongue more often using a noun to modify a noun instead of an adjective. This meaning is certainly borne out from the few verses which follow the parable (16:10-13), particularly where our Lord says, "You cannot serve God and mammon." Some think the expression refers to riches unjustly acquired, especially since the publicans formed a part of our Lord's audience. But such individuals still retained the obligation in justice of making restitution. "Injustice," says Fr. Lagrange, "has left its defiling touch on money."[1] But in no sense whatever did our Lord commend the injustice of the steward. Neither did he intend that almsgiving compensates for ill-gotten goods. "When comparisons are set out by Holy Scripture the thing itself is not praised by the Scriptures but an illustration is simply taken from it." (St. Aug. on Psalm 7:6). Therefore the purpose and teaching of the

[1] Lagrange, "The Gospel of Jesus Christ," Vol. II, p. 69.

parable is clear. Our Savior simply praises the foresightedness of the children of this world, and not their unjust actions; in like manner, the children of light, that is, Christians should imitate such prudence, not indeed for the purpose of cheating one another, but in providing for one another, particularly the poor who are the friends of Christ.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

SAINT JOHN'S EVIDENCE OF THE RESURRECTION

"Then that other disciple also went in, who came first to the sepulchre: and he saw, and believed. For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead" (Jn. 20:8-9).

Clearly the Evangelist implies that "he believed" because of what "he saw" when once within the tomb. What he believed was not merely Mary's report that the body had been removed. When John writes thus absolutely of "believing," he regularly implies some object of divine faith. And it was rather Peter who believed that "they had taken away the Lord." Finally, John's account of Christ's reception in the cenacle that evening omits to mention the alarm (Lk. 24:37-43) at first created by his penetration of the barred doors. As if quite prepared for that, John records only the joy which his companions presently shared with him. One sight of the tomb's interior had convinced him of the resurrection, which becomes the subject of his next verse.

What, then, did John see inside the tomb? Only what Peter had already seen before him—"the linen cloths lying, and the napkin that had been about his head, not lying with the linen cloths, but apart, wrapped up into one place" (6-7). Peter, confronted with these objects, "went away wondering in himself at that which was come to pass" (Lk. 24:12). Yet John describes no other evidence for his own instant and firm belief.

So have most commentators rightly read him. Further, they generally agree in assigning a reason why the mere aspect of the grave-clothes had this profound effect upon him. In his description of the objects they read a note of orderly disposal: the shroud here, the napkin there, and the latter even folded. This, they tell us, proves leisurely action, and so excludes the haste of a stealthy removal. John could thus conclude at sight that the body had not been carried away, and must therefore have departed by its own vital energy.

Had this really been John's reasoning, Peter would naturally have drawn the same conclusion. On its own merits, moreover, the argument from evidence of the mere absence of haste breaks down under very slight reflection. For both Apostles were well aware that no

removal by stealth, however hasty, could have been possible. They knew that the tomb was sealed and guarded by soldiers. The women, on the contrary, had not seen the spot since Friday afternoon. At Bethania they were beyond the limit of the "sabbath day's journey" from the crest of Olivet to Jerusalem (Acts 1:12). Kept by the sabbath law from approaching the city on Saturday, they knew nothing of the sealing and guarding of the tomb "the next day" after the crucifixion (Mt. 27:62). Hence, on Easter morning, they could even discuss who would remove the stone for them (Mk. 16:3). But the Apostles, lodging within the precincts of Jerusalem, knew of the official custody. They saw at once that to secure the body would be impossible without the connivance of the guard; they could also see that the latter, if bribed to co-operate, would for their own sakes take care that an abductor was not disturbed in the act. Hence, an orderly arrangement of the grave-clothes would be no proof to either Peter or John that the body had not been stolen. It might even suggest the contrary.

This weakness of the favorite explanation suggests a deeper probing of John's words. Why did the grave-clothes mean to him what they could not mean to Peter? Had John seen them enshrouding the sacred body on Friday evening? He alone tells of the co-operation of Nicodemus with Joseph of Arimathea in the burial, and his account is otherwise quite as detailed as those of the Synoptics. Indeed, it seems uncommonly so in view of the peculiar character of his Gospel. John himself must have assisted at the hasty burial, whether before or after he conducted the Blessed Mother "to his own." The position of the shrouded body in the inner vault would thus be stamped upon his memory.

If now, after so brief an interval, John should stand again within the tomb, and see the grave-clothes in that same position, but empty and collapsed by their unsupported weight, one conclusion would be instant and irresistible. The body which they once enclosed must have left them there by simply passing through them. After this, John could record no surprise on his own part when the same body, on that very evening, suddenly appeared within barred doors.

But what of his particular notice of that one detail, "the napkin that had been about his head"? Did he not see it "apart, wrapped up into one place"? Here especially the Greek deserves more careful study. In any case it seems unnatural that the napkin, if "neatly folded" (as a recent commentator thinks), had not been laid with the other wrappings. But in fact it is not said to have been folded. This would normally require *πτύσσω*, Hippocrates' very word for folding a bandage, and used by Luke (4:20) for the closing or ensheathing of a sacred scroll, while its compound *ἀναπτύσσω* denotes (4:17) the open-

ing of the same. Instead, John sees the napkin ἐντετυλιγμένον. The noun τύλη, from which this verb derives, denoted in Attic the "roll" or "knot" of cloth which the public porter inserted between his shoulder and its burden. Thus the shape implied is (at least remotely) cylindrical. Instead of folded the napkin was "in-rolled," or, as we might say, "rolled up." So had it been when still "about his head"; and this same verb (as transitive) is Matthew's (27:59) and Luke's (23:53) expression for the "enwrapping" or "entwining" of the body entire.

This participle is modified by χωρίς, "apart," and then by the adverbial phrase εἰς ἕνα τόπον. The latter Zorell takes to mean "separate," under the influence of the two preceding words. One naturally hesitates to differ, and the present suggestion is by no means urged—nor necessary to the argument. But "into one place" is a familiar Hebraism for "together," at least when used of *different* objects tending to one term (LXX, Eccles. 3:20; 6:6). Could it be thus applied to a *single* object as collapsing "together" in a more compact form? Certainly, this stretches the possibilities. If εἰς ἕνα τόπον here means "together" as a term of motion, it departs from the standard New Testament phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. Yet it is significant that this latter phrase is unknown to John's writings, and that for the collection of many things "together" he writes εἰς ἕν (11:52). It therefore seems possible (though far from certain) that εἰς ἕνα τόπον in this passage means "together," as does its literal Hebrew equivalent. If so, the witness tells us that he saw the napkin "apart, rolled up together"—or "apart in a sunken roll."

In either meaning of this final phrase, the description of the napkin completes John's picture of demonstrative evidence. The article would be "apart" from the shroud, either by the length of the face, or because it had fallen slightly away as well as together when suddenly left to its own weight. The position of the whole group of wrappings could tell but one tale: the body which they once enclosed had passed through them, leaving them as they were, and as no human hand could have arranged them without support from within. If the convergent evidence justifies this conclusion, John's instant and firm belief is fully explained by his own description.

WILLIAM MCCLELLAN, S.J.

PROBLEMS IN BIBLE REVISION

ST. PAUL'S EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS

In the revised translation of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians the language and rhythm of the Rheims-Douay have been retained wherever possible. By following this procedure, which was one of the chief principles governing the revision of the New Testament, the result achieved is a translation substantially the same as that of the Rheims-Douay in spite of the presence of many variations in detail. For the most part the changes introduced concern minor details. In some cases the revised translation differs considerably from the Rheims-Douay. The present article seeks to call attention to a number of the more important instances in which the revised translation differs from the wording of the Rheims-Douay.

1. 1 Thess. 1:3. *Rheims-Douay:* "Being mindful of the work of your faith, and labor, and charity, and of the enduring of the hope of our Lord Jesus Christ before God and our Father."

This version adheres closely to the Latin Vulgate, viz.: *memores operis fidei vestrae, et laboris, et caritatis, et sustinentiae spei Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ante Deum et Patrem nostrum.*

Revised translation: *"Being mindful before God our Father, of your work of faith, your labor of charity, and your firm hope in our Lord Jesus Christ."*

In this rendering three changes are to be observed: 1) the changed position of the words: "before God our Father"; 2) the use of "your," and 3) the omission of "and" between "God our Father" and after "faith."

1) In the Rheims-Douay word order which is that of the Greek text and Vulgate the phrase "before God our Father" may mean that the faith, charity, and hope of the Thessalonians are true and sincere before God, or that Paul living as he does in the presence of God recalls their faith, charity, and hope. In the revised translation the latter view has been adopted. Accordingly the phrase has been transposed and placed after the words "being mindful."[1]

Compare the following in *Spencer:*[2] "We remember unceasingly before our God and Father your work of faith, your labor of love, and the steadfastness of your hope in our Lord Jesus Christ."

[1] Cf. J. M. Voste, O.P., *Commentarius in Epistolas ad Thessalonicenses,* Romae, p. 62; B. A. Piconio, O.M.Cap., Trans. by A. H. Prichard, *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul,* 3 vols. London, vol. 3, p. 5; J. A. Van Steenkiste, *Commentarius in omnes S. Pauli Epistolas,* vol. 2, p. 210; Charles J. Callan, O.P., *The Epistles of St. Paul,* vol. 2, p. 204.

[2] *The New Testament,* A New Translation from the Original Greek, by F. A. Spencer, O.P., Macmillan Co., New York.

Goodspeed:[3] "For we can never forget before our God and Father your energetic faith, your loving service, and your unwavering expectation of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The *Westminster Version,*[4] however, retains the phrase "before God our Father" at the end of the sentence: "recalling your work of faith and your toil and your steadiness of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ before God our Father."

The *King James Version* is similar: "Remembering without ceasing your work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father."

2) In the revised translation "your" occurs three times although it is expressed but once in the Vulgate and the Rheims-Douay. The Greek ὑμῶν, however, which the Vulgate translates *vestrae* to agree with *fidei* in reality modifies all three virtues practised by the Thessalonians. The repetition of "your" is, therefore, justified. In addition the sentence gains in clarity and emphasis.

3) The four "ands" found in this verse as rendered by the Rheims-Douay exactly represent the number of "ands" found in the Vulgate. Inasmuch as too many "ands" tend to weaken an English sentence they may be omitted wherever they are not strictly necessary. In the revised translation the "ands" have been reduced from four to two. The presence of "and" in the phrase "before God and our Father" is due to a figure of speech (hendiadys). It may, therefore, be omitted in translation. After "faith" there is no "and" in the Greek text. The revised translation here follows the Greek reading. With the two "ands" eliminated this sentence gains strength of expression in English.

2. 1 Thess. 5:14; 2 Thess. 3:6,7,11, are related passages, and, therefore, may be grouped together for analysis.

1 Thess. 5:14. *Rheims-Douay:* "And we beseech you, brethren, rebuke the unquiet, comfort the feeble minded, support the weak, be patient towards all men."

Revised translation: *"And we beseech you, brethren, to reprove the idlers, to comfort the faint-hearted, to support the weak, to be patient towards all men."*

Two changes are to be noted here: 1) the Rheims-Douay rendering "feeble minded" is changed to "faint-hearted," a change which more accurately reproduces the Vulgate *pusillanimes,* and the Greek ὀλιγοψύχους, and removes any misconception which might arise as to mental health of certain Thessalonian Christians, who are suffering

[3] Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The New Testament,* An American Translation. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

[4] The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures, Longmans, Green and Co., New York.

from unfounded fears of an imminent parousia and not from debility of mind; 2) Those who are called "the unquiet" in the Rheims-Douay are in the revised translation termed "the idlers." The same individuals are again referred to in 2 Thess. 3:6,7,11.

2 Thess. 3:6,7,11. *Rheims-Douay:* "And we charge you, brethren, ... that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly, and not according to the tradition which they have received from us. [7] .... for we were not disorderly among you; .... [11] For we have heard that there are some among you who walk disorderly, working not at all, but curiously meddling."

Revised translation: *"And we charge you, brethren, ... to withdraw yourselves from every brother who lives in idleness, and not in accordance with the teaching received from us.* [7] *.... for we were not idle while with you, ...* [11] *For it has been reported to us that there are some among you who are living in idleness, engaged in no work, but are busy at meddling."*

Here the related terms: "idlers," "idle," and "to live in idleness," imitate the uniformity of expression found in the Greek text, where the cognate forms: ἄτακτος, ἀτάκτως, and ἀτακτέω, occur. This uniformity of rendering is not observed in the Vulgate, which translates ἀτάκτους as *inquietos,* ἀτάκτως at one time as *inquiete* and at another as *inordinate,* and οὐκ ἠτακτήσαμεν *non inquiete fuimus.* A similar variation of expression is found in the Rheims-Douay. *Inquietos* appears as "the unquiet," whereas *non-inquieti* is rendered "not disorderly." *Inquiete* and *inordinate* are translated "disorderly."

Moreover, the Vulgate renderings *inquieti, inquiete,* and *inordinate ambulare,* which are reproduced in the Rheims-Douay as "unquiet, disorderly," and "to walk disorderly," fail to give the exact sense of the Greek expressions: ἀτακτέω, ἄτακτος, ἀτάκτως,[5] which, as the context indicates, have reference to those idle Christians at Thessalonica who are not observing the ordered form of Christian life, and are disturbing others by their vain fears concerning the nearness of the parousia.

By the substitution of the words: "idle, in idleness" for the term "disorderly" a more exact meaning has been given, and at the same time a misleading translation is avoided. Such expressions as "walking disorderly," "who walk disorderly" (who live disorderly), or "were not disorderly," are apt to be misunderstood. In police court usage and newspaper reports "disorderly conduct" refers specifically to immoral actions of a sexual nature. (Cf. expressions: "a disorderly person, a disorderly house.") Many, therefore, in reading the word "disorderly" in these passages of the Epistles to the Thessalonians might

[5] Cf. F. Zorell, S.J., *Novi Testamenti Lexicon Graecum,* Parisiis, 1911.

naturally conclude that Paul is reproving those guilty of sexual sins, whereas in fact his reproaches are directed against those idle individuals who are disturbing the Church at Thessalonica.

Compare *Spencer:* 1 Thess. 5:14; "And we beg of you, brethren, admonish the unruly, encourage the timid, support the weak, be patient toward all."

2 Thess. 3:6,7,11; "We charge you, brethren, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to withdraw yourselves from every brother whose conduct is disorderly, and not in accord with the tradition received from us.... for we did not lead an ill-regulated life among you;.... For we hear of some conducting themselves in an undisciplined way among you, doing no work at all, but meddling."

Westminster Version: 1 Thess. 5:14; "And we exhort you, brethren, admonish the disorderly, encourage the faint-hearted, support the weak, show patience towards all."

2 Thess. 3:6,7,11; "Now we charge you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ to withdraw yourselves from every brother that is disorderly, and walketh not according to the tradition which you received from us .... we were not disorderly whilst with you, ... For we hear of some among you who are disorderly, doing no work, but interfering with others;"

Goodspeed: 1 Thess. 5:14: "We beg you, brothers, warn the idlers, cheer up the despondent, keep hold of the weak, be patient with everybody."

2 Thess. 3:6,7,11; "We charge you, brothers, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, to keep away from any brother who lives in idleness, instead of following the teaching you received from us .... for I was not idle when I was with you;.... For we hear that some of you are living in idleness, mere busybodies, not doing any work."[6]

An improvement over the Rheims-Douay may be noted in the rendering: "engaged in no work, but are busy at meddling," (2 Thess. 3:11), which replaces: "working not at all, but curiously meddling." This restores Paul's biting sarcasm, although it does not wholly recapture his play on words. Paul's thought is that these individual are not busy supporting themselves, but they are busy stirring up trouble. The "busy at meddling" also eliminates the vagueness of the *curiose agentes* of the Vulgate, and of the "curiously meddling" of the Rheims-Douay.

Compare the following: *Goodspeed:* "mere busy-bodies, not doing any work." *Westminster Version:* "doing no work, but interfering with others." *Spencer:* "doing no work at all, but meddling." *King James Version:* "working not at all, but are busybodies."

[6] The King James Version has "unruly" in 1 Thess. 5:14, and "disorderly" in 2 Thess. 3:6,7,11.

3. 1 Thess. 4:10b-11. A notable change of wording occurs in this passage of the revised translation, in which Paul is also dealing with the fault of idleness.

Rheims-Douay: [10b] "But we entreat you, brethren, that you abound more: [11] And that you use your endeavour to be quiet, and that you do your own business, and work with your hands, as we commanded you: and that you walk honestly towards them that are without; and that you want nothing of any man's."

Revised translation: [10b] *"But we beseech you, brethren, to make even greater progress.* [11] *Strive to live peacefully, engaged in your own business, working with your own hands, as we commanded you, so that your life may appear praiseworthy in the eyes of unbelievers, and you be not in want of anything from others."*

The revised translation departs from the too literal reproduction of the Latin Vulgate found in the Rheims-Douay. Compare for example, 1) "make even greater progress" for "abound the more." 2) "your life may appear praiseworthy in the eyes of unbelievers" for "walk honestly towards them that are without." 3) "you be not in want of anything from others" for "that you want nothing of any man's."

This last passage (3) in the revised translation makes it clear that there is no question of coveting the goods of another. The point Paul is stressing is that they should not by their idleness make it necessary for others to support them.

Compare *Goodspeed:* "But we do entreat you, brothers, to surpass yourselves in striving to live quietly and mind your own affairs, and work with your hands, as we directed you, so that you may have the respect of outsiders, and not be dependent upon anybody."

Westminster Version: "But we exhort you, brethren, that you abound still more, and that you seek to be peaceful, keeping to your own business and working with your hands, as we charged you, so that your behaviour be honorable in the eyes of them that are without and you have need of nothing."

Spencer: "But we beg you, brethren, to progress still more. Have an ambition to live quietly and to attend to your own business, and to work with your hands, as we directed you; so that your way of life may be reputable in the eyes of outsiders, and you be in need of nothing."

King James Version: "But we beseech you, brethren, that ye increase more and more; and that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you: that ye may walk honestly towards them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing."

4. 1 Thess. 4:1. The change which has been made in this passage is due principally to the adoption in the revised translation of a variant reading and to the transposition of certain words.

Rheims-Douay: "For the rest, therefore, brethren, we pray and beseech you in the Lord Jesus, that as you have received from us how you ought to walk, and to please God, so also you would walk, that you may abound."

Revised translation: *"Moreover, brethren, even as you have learned from us how you ought to live to please God—as indeed you are living—we ask and exhort you in the Lord Jesus to make even greater progress."*

The variant *"sicut et ambulatis"* has been adopted in place of *sic et ambuletis.*[7]

The words "we ask and exhort you in the Lord Jesus" have been transposed in order to give directness to the appeal and thus make the sentence uninvolved in English. Other translators, however, evidently consider that the sentence remains more characteristically Pauline if these words be retained at the beginning of the sentence.

Compare *Westminster Version:* "For the rest, brethren, we beseech and exhort you in the Lord Jesus, that, even as you received from us how you should walk to please God—and do indeed so walk—you abound still more."

Spencer: "Finally, brethren, we ask and exhort you in the Lord Jesus, that, as you have learned from us how you ought to live in pleasing God—just as indeed you do live—so you would progress still more."

Goodspeed: "Now, brothers, we ask and entreat you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, to live as you learned from us that you must live to please God—as indeed you are doing, only do it more and more."

King James Version: "Furthermore then we beseech you, brethren, and exhort you by the Lord Jesus, that as ye have received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, so ye would abound more and more."

5. 2 Thess. 3:12. The word order of this passage has also been changed in the revised translation with a view of gaining greater directness of speech. Thus it has been modified to read: *"Now in the Lord Jesus Christ we command and exhort such persons as these to work in peace and to eat their own bread,"* in place of the Rheims-Douay, "Now we charge them that are such, and beseech them by the Lord Jesus Christ, that, working with silence, they would eat their own bread."

[7] Wordsworth and White incorporate the reading *sicut et ambulatis* in their critical text of the Vulgate.

Compare *Spencer:* "Now we command and exhort such in the Lord Jesus Christ to work in quietness, and earn their own living."

Westminster Version: "Such as these we charge and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ that they work peacefully and earn the food they eat."

Goodspeed: "Now with the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ we charge and exhort such people to keep quiet and do their work and earn their own living."

6. In 1 Thess. 4:3-4; Spencer and Goodspeed have translated the Greek σκεῦος, (Vulgate, *vas*), "wife." Thus: *Spencer:* [3] "For this is the will of God—your sanctification; that you keep yourselves from impurity; [4] that each of you should know how to acquire for himself a wife of his own, to have and hold in sanctity and honor."

Goodspeed: [3] "It is God's will that you should be consecrated, that you abstain from immorality, that each of you learn to take a wife for himself from pure and honorable motives."

But in this passage the revised translation retains Paul's original figurative expression "vessel," which is also found in the Latin Vulgate, Rheims-Douay and King James Version, thus: [3] *"For this is the will of God, your sanctification; that you should abstain from fornication;* [4] *that every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honor."*[8]

It is not certain that Paul's figure of speech "vessel" refers to a man's wife. On the contrary there are weighty reasons for thinking that it means a man's own body. It is better, therefore, to allow Paul's original figurative expression to remain in the translation, and to discuss the disputed meaning of it in the footnotes and commentary.

It should also be noted in the revised translation of the Epistles to the Thessalonians that many of the lengthy Pauline sentences have been broken up into shorter ones. Attention may be called to some instances of this change.

a) 1 Thess. 1:2-5 has been made into three sentences instead of one. Thus: "[2] *We give thanks to God always for you all, continually making a remembrance of you in our prayers,* [3] *being mindful before God our Father, of your work of faith, your labor of charity, and your firm hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.* [4] *We know, brethren beloved of God, your election.* [5] *For our Gospel was not delivered to you in word only, but in power also, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much fullness, as indeed you know what manner of men we have been among you for your sakes."*

[8] The Rheims-Douay is identical, and the Westminster Version and King James Version are practically identical in wording. Although other translations in addition to the ones mentioned in this article have been compared it was considered unnecessary to mention them all.

Another example of this is 1 Thess 4:10-12. Thus: [10] *"For indeed you practice it towards all the brethren in the whole of Macedonia. But we beseech you, brethren, to make even greater progress.* [11] *Strive to live peacefully, engaged in your own business, working with your own hands, as we commanded you,* [12] *so that your life may appear praiseworthy in the eyes of unbelievers, and you be not in want of anything from others."*

b) 2 Thess. 1:3-5 appears as four sentences in place of one. Thus: [3] *"We are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren. It is fitting that we should, because your faith grows exceedingly and your charity one for the other abounds.* [4] *And because of this we ourselves boast of you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and tribulations which you are enduring.* [5] *In this there is a proof of the just judgment of God counting you worthy of the kingdom of God, for which also you suffer."*

c) More numerous are the instances in which one sentence has been made into two, v.g., 1 Thess. 2:9,15,16; 5:8,12-13; 2 Thess. 1:6-8.

1 Thess. 3:6-8 still remains the same lengthy sentence. This must be so, because the translator is not an editor, and therefore cannot take the liberty of rewriting the sentence. This passage has also been retained as one sentence in Spencer, Goodspeed, the Westminster Version and the King James Version.

In conclusion it may be said that the translators of the Rheims-Douay have done their work well in the Epistles to the Thessalonians. In some cases the sense of the original is obscured or not correctly rendered by a too faithful adherence to the Latin Vulgate. Where this is judged to be so the revised translation looks through the Latin rendering to the original Greek, and strives to reproduce it. The work of revising the Rheims-Douay version of the Epistles to the Thessalonians has not been accomplished without consulting the current English translations, and due acknowledgement is hereby made for any help they have furnished, or for any influence they have exerted on the language of the revised translation. In some cases, however, where a similarity of wording exists, the similarity is merely coincidental and does not result from dependence on one or the other of the current tranlations.

C. J. COSTELLO, O.M.I.

ARCHEOLOGICAL CORNER

San el-Hagar (Tanis), Egypt

The discovery of a pharaoh's tomb is a major event in the history of archeological exploration. As none had been discovered since 1922, when the Earl of Carnarvon and Mr. Howard Carter brought to light the dazzling treasures of Tut-ankh-amon's tomb, the announcement from Cairo on March 19 that Prof. Pierre Montet had found one near San el-Hagar in the Nile Delta, was welcome news. The tomb has been described in preliminary reports as a low structure of white limestone. Evidently, it had been built for Psou-sen-nes, a pharaoh of the twenty-first dynasty, whose name is written all over the walls of the funerary chamber. Psou-sen-nes ruled in Tanis about 954-942 B.C., and possibly may have been one of the numerous fathers-in-law of King Solomon (3 Kgs. 3:1; 9:16).

In the tomb were found a silver coffin, two skeletons, a half dozen vases with covers in the shape of animal and human heads, and a large conical jar about four feet high, sealed with mud. A long carnelian necklace was on one of the skeletons. It was taken for granted that the mummy in the silver coffin would be that of Psou-sen-nes. The mummy, however, was not that of Psou-sen-nes. The gold ornaments with which it was covered from head to foot were engraved with the name of Sheshonq. As there were several Sheshonqs, further study will be necessary to determine which one this may be.

Sheshonq I, the founder of the twenty-second dynasty, is identified with Secac (Shishak) who befriended Jeroboam when the latter fled from King Solomon (3 Kgs. 11:40). In the fifth year of Roboam (c. 924 B.C.), Sheshonq invaded Palestine, and plundered the temple of Jerusalem (3 Kgs. 14:25-26; 2 Par. 12:2-9). On his return to Egypt, he erected an inscription at Karnak, giving a long list of places conquered on this expedition. His name has also been found on a monument at Byblos in Syria, and on a broken stele at Megiddo.

King Farouk, who is keenly interested in the archeology of his historic country, hastened to the excavations, and assisted at the opening of some of the vases. These were found to contain silver boxes about eight inches long shaped like mummy cases, and inscribed with Sheshonq's name. It is hoped that the large conical jar may contain papyri, or other inscriptional material. There are good reasons to believe that other royal tombs may be found in the vicinity, and all eyes will be turned toward San el-Hagar in expectation.

The ruins of San el-Hagar, however, have an interest of their own, apart from the recently discovered tomb. Mariette had done some

digging there in 1860, and Petrie in 1884. Montet's systematic work since 1929 has yielded excellent results, and the site is now regarded as one of the most promising for archeological research in Egypt.

According to Montet, San el-Hagar is on the site of the ancient Egyptian Sechet Tchant, known as Zoan to the Hebrews, and as Tanis to the Greeks. Zoan of the Hebrew Bible appears as Tanis in the Septuagint and Vulgate. When the Hyksos, the so-called Asiatic shepherd kings, invaded the Delta sometime in the first half of the second millennium B.C., they made Sechet Tchant their capital under the name of Avaris. Ahmose I, the founder of the eighteenth dynasty, expelled the Hyksos about 1580 B.C., and the site was more or less neglected until the nineteenth dynasty when Rameses II (c. 1292-1225) began developing it. Many monuments of Rameses have been found, and it is evident that he did much toward making the site a truly royal city. Montet believes that Rameses established his northern capital here under the name of Pi-Rameses. Egyptologists, however, have been slow in accepting Montet's views.

The excavations at San el-Hagar are of particular interest to Biblical students. Was it here that Abraham came, and later Joseph? Was it here that Moses was reared? If these ruins are Tanis, then it was here that Moses worked his wonders in the presence of Pharaoh (Ps. 77:12,43). Rameses (Ramesse) is the starting point of the Exodus (Ex. 12:37). After forty years of wandering, the Israelites appeared before Jericho, but archeologists differ by a century and a half regarding the conquest of that city (Garstang, 1400; Albright, 1375-1300; Vincent, 1250). Will the excavations at San el-Hagar help ultimately in throwing some light on the problem? We are hopeful.

* * * * * * *

The amount of literature appearing every year in the archeological field is bewildering even to the specialist, and a compendium, giving outstanding developments and trends in various phases of such research becomes almost a necessity. *The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible* is such a compendium. In a series of eight clearly written, well documented essays, competent specialists indicate the present state of research in Syro-Palestinian Archaeology (Albright), Old Testament Studies (Barton), New Testament Studies (Cadbury), History of Writing in the Near East (Flight), Anatolian and Hittite Studies (Goetze), Mesopotamian Studies (Meek), Arabian Studies (Montgomery), Egyptian Studies (Wilson). There is also a supplement, illustrating ancient Babylonian business (Grant).[1] A similar volume is *Record and Revelation,* which gives a good summary

[1] *The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible* (Elihu Grant, editor), The American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven 1938.

of recent trends in non-Catholic Old Testament Criticism.[2] Having consulted Père Abel's *Géographie de la Palestine* frequently during the past year, we can recommend it not only as a scholarly, but also as an interesting and serviceable work.[3]

* * * * * * *

Thousands of cuneiform tablets have been found by archeologists in recent years, and very probably many more thousands will be discovered in the near fueure. It will take at least another generation of scholars to decipher them all. New light has been thrown on the Hyksos, Habiri, Hittites, and very recently on the Hurrians, probably the Horites and Hivites of the Bible. Little by little, the jig-saw puzzles of ancient history are being pieced together, but the number of qualified workers is small. There is plenty of original material available in the Oriental field for doctoral dissertations. More than 30,000 tablets were found at Persepolis alone, and another 25,000 at Mari. Nuzi, Atchana, Ras Shamra, Boghaz Keui have also added to the number.

EDWARD CERNY, S.S.

[2] *Record and Revelation,* Essays on the Old Testament by members of the Society for Old Testament Study (H. Wheeler Robinson, editor), Oxford 1938.

[3] *Géograptie de la Palestine* par le P. F.—M. Abel, des Frères Prêcheurs. Tome I, Géographie physique et historique. Tome II, Géographie politique. Les villes. Gabalda, Paris 1933, 1938.

BIBLICAL NEWS

As already noted in the April number of the Quarterly, the Catholic Biblical Association has undertaken the task of translating the Old Testament into English. The principles regulating this work have been approved by the Editorial Board appointed for the Revision of the Old Testament.

Principles Governing the Revision of the Old Testament

I. BASIC TEXT: a. the work is to be a translation of the Vulgate; any Edition of the Vulgate Text may be used.

b. The sense of the Vulgate, when uncertain, may and should be clarified by means of its originals.

c. As regards differences in tenses: the proper meaning of the tenses should be determined from the Hebrew, and this not only for the Psalms, but for all the books for which we have the Hebrew originals.

d. The same attention should be given to the proper translation of the original idiom apart from the tenses, when the idiom is not precisely represented in the Latin. But note that attention to the idiom of the original must not be overdone, e.g., by adhering to the co-ordination of the Hebrew where St. Jerome has introduced the sub-ordination of the Latin. Further, St. Jerome retained some Hebrew idioms, e.g., 2 Kgs. 12:5.; Isa. 5:1, which do not give a satisfactory sense in Latin.

e. The proper names translated by St. Jerome are to be restored, both persons and places.

f. As regards the unification of proper names and equivalents, use that one which approaches the original (which is not necessarily the Massoretic Text); the forms of the proper name in the Vulgate, such as Samson, Galaad, Nabuchodonosor, are closer to the primitive form than that of the Massoretic Text.

g. Any textual difference of the Vulgate and its originals should not be noted in the text, but in the footnotes; where the Latin presupposes but misunderstands the Hebrew text, the proper translation can be inserted in the text itself.

h. Such textual variants as might help clarify the passage should be incorporated in the footnotes. (The revisor should remember the popular character of the work and not indulge his inclination to *critica textus* beyond what is necessary.)

i. Where St. Jerome has given a Messianic interpretation but none exists, the Vulgate is to be retained in the text, but the proper sense provided in the footnotes, e.g., Isa. 2:22; 16:1; 45:8; Dan. 9:26.

II. EXTENT OF THE REVISION: The work in its relation to the present English Text is determined by the following principles:

a. Keeping in mind the above principles, whenever it is necessary, for the sake of clarity, to introduce words which are not in the Vulgate, they must not be italicized.

b. All real paraphrasing must be restricted to the footnotes.

c. While free to make whatever changes he deems justified, the revisor would be guided as much as possible by the diction, style, and rhythm of the present text. All defects in language of the present text should naturally be corrected.

III. LANGUAGE: a. Eliminate obsolete words and forms, e.g., omit "ye," but retain "thine" and "thou."

b. Employ Webster for spelling, taking always the first spelling if two are given.

c. Do not capitalize the pronouns referring to Christ and to God.

d. Capitalize the first word of each sentence and not the first word of each verse as in the present text.

e. For uniformity of grammar, punctuation, and English usage generally, the Committee adopted The Blue Book of Good English, Doubleday-Doran. This is also known under the title of A Manual of Good English.

f. Long and involved sentences in the original should be broken up in accordance with the genius of modern English. Care, however, must be had to preserve the accurate sense of the Vulgate. This should be observed also where readings of the present text are retained.

g. In particular, "Dominus" as a proper name should be distinguished in type from the use of the same as a mere title.

h. Exactness and simplicity should be the aim.

IV. PREFACES: The general preface, both to the edition of the text and to the commentary, are to be written by the Editorial Board.

The author of each revision should prepare a brief preface to the Book on which he is working for insertion in the edition of the text. This should be restricted to from 300 to 500 words. It can be extended in the commentary. It should give from Special Introduction whatever will assist the reader in understanding the Book.

V. EXTERNAL FORM: a. The text is to be arranged in paragraphs instead of the present verse form. The printed text of St. John's Gospel, Hetzenauer, Bibl. Sacra Vulg. Editionis, (3) Ratisbon, Pustet, are suggested as models, in addition to Gramatica.

b. Verse and chapter enumerations will eventually be placed in the margin. It is suggested, however, for the convenience of the editors that the revisors place the number at the beginning of each verse in the text.

c. Parallels and cross references should be added by the revisors. They will find place at the foot of the page, before the notes.

d. Poetic passages should be in verse and stanza form. Kittel's Biblia Hebraica should be used as a guide.

e. The main divisions of each book should be written in heavy type; the subdivisions in ordinary type. The main sub-topics should be indented at the head of the paragraph.

VI. ILLUSTRATION: Choice of maps and illustrations is left to the Editorial Board. Recommendations, however, for both may be made by members of the Revision Committee.

VII. COMMENTARY: The commentary on the various Books is to be prepared by the one revising the text. Thus the work of revision and commentary can be accomplished at the same time.

There are no special principles adopted for the direction of this commentary. The above topics, where applicable, may be taken as a guide. The published commentary on St. John's Gospel may be taken as an illustration of what is desired.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine will sponsor a two or three volume commentary.

VIII. PREPARATION OF MANUSCRIPT: To facilitate the work of the Editorial Board, it is requested that the following practical points be observed in the preparation of the material submitted to them.

a. The work should be typewritten, with double spacing and wide margin.

b. The material for the commentary can be submitted separately.

IX. TIME: No time is fixed for the execution of this work. It will depend upon the individual revisor and the demands of thoroughness.

It was decided to publish the O. T. in sections according to the decision of the Editorial Board.

The following revisors have been appointed by the Editorial Board for the Revision of the Old Testament:

Genesis:	Rev. Edward Mangan, C.SS.R., S.S.L.
Exodus:	Rev. James E. Coleran, S.J., S.T.L., S.S.L.
Leviticus:	Rev. Charles F. DeVine, C.SS.R., S.S.L.
Numbers:	Rev. Gilmore H. Guyot, C.M., S.S.L.
Deuteronomy:	Rev. John J. Dougherty, S.T.L., S.S.L.
Josue:	Rev. John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Judges *Ruth*	Rev. John F. Rowan, S.T.D., S.S.L.

1 Kings *2 Kings* *1 Paralip.*	Rev. John Ujlaki, O.S.B., S.T.D. Rev. Justin Krellner, O.S.B., S.T.D.
3 Kings *4 Kings* *2 Paralip.*	Rev. John J. Collins, S.J., S.S.L.
1 Esdras *2 Esdras*	Rev. Maurice Hofer, S.S.L.
Tobias *Judith* *Esther*	Rev. Kevin Smyth, O.M.Cap., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Job:	Rev. Edward J. Byrne, S.T.D.
Psalms:	Rev. Albert M. Casey, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.L. Rev. John T. Curran, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Proverbs:	Rev. James M. McGlinchey, C.M., S.T.D.
Ecclesiastes:	Rev. Joseph Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Canticle of Canticles:	Rev. John Weissengoff, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Wisdom:	Rev. Patrick W. Skehan, S.T.D.
Ecclesiasticus:	Rev. Matthew Stapleton, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Isaias:	Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.
Jeremias:	Rev. Patrick Cummins, O.S.B., S.T.D.
Ezechiel:	Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.D.
Daniel:	Rev. William A. Dowd, S.J., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Osee: *Amos:*	Rev. Cyril McGuire, O.F.M.
Joel: *Abdias:*	Rev. Henry Dillon, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Jonas *Micheas* *Nahum* *Habacuc* *Sophonias*	Rev. William L. Newton, S.S.D.
Aggeus *Zacharias* *Malachias*	Rev. Edward A. Cerny, S.S., S.T.D.
I Machabees *II Machabees*	Rev. Charles H. Pickar, O.S.A., S.T.L., S.S.L.

During the past few months, work on the Revision of the New Testament has progressed rapidly. The various manuscripts have been resubmitted to the Editorial Board, and they are now ready for their final review. Once they have met the approval of the Editorial Board, the material will be handed over to the printer. It is hoped that the latter will begin setting up the type, for the Gospels at least, by October 1.

The eminent scholar and author, Canon Patrick Boylan of Ireland, was recently appointed a member of the Editorial Board for the Revision of the New Testament. Canon Boylan, together with Monsignor Barton and Father Lattey, S.J., both of England, will review the text of the Revision.

His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, recently appointed the following to serve as members of the Pontifical Commission for Biblical Studies: Their Eminences, Cardinals Michael Faulhaber, Achille Lienhart, Rodrigo Villeneuve, Luigi Maglione, and Giuseppe Pizzardo.

The Rev. William Leonard of the diocese of Limerick, Ireland, and professor of Sacred Scripture at St. Patrick's Seminary, Sydney, Australia, received the doctorate in Sacred Scripture from the Biblical Institute, Dec. 15, 1939. Father Leonard wrote on the "Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Critical Problem and Use of the Old Testament."

Dr. Lorenz Dürr, professor of Old Testament Exegesis and Oriental Languages at the Theological Academy, Regensburg, died last February at the age of 53 years His death is a great loss for Old Testament scholarship. Besides an excellent knowledge of the Old Testament, Dr. Dürr possessed a comprehensive knowledge of the religions and culture of the Ancient East. We are indebted to him for a number of publications dealing with the nature and function of the Old Testament Prophets. May he rest in peace. And may others of his attainments rise to carry on the work in his important field.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDWARD LEEN, C.S.SP., *The True Vine and its Branches* (New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1938). $2.50.

There are two ways of using Scriptural texts, both legitimate, useful and effective in their several spheres. There is the painstaking way of selecting a text or a passage, or a whole book for that matter, and laboriously determining its exact meaning as far as it is humanly possible to do so. It is the way of the commentators. There is the other way of starting with a doctrine or a dogma or a whole system of doctrinal concepts and using Scripture texts either as proofs or illustrations or as a convenient mode of expressing a thought which is previously accepted as revealed truth on the ground of an authentic Catholic tradition or conciliary or Papal pronouncement. It is not a mere accommodation of texts to usages foreign to them; a practice however, which may be tolerated and occasionally employed to good effect (v.g., p. 179), but which would be harmful, not useful, if presented as Scriptural proof. All of these practices we find in the work under review, whose praises it is neither necessary to sing at this date, nor is it the province of this review to point out. It is the plentiful use of Sacred Scripture as a sure foundation for solid spirituality that engages our attention.

The title itself is Scriptural in its implications; the fifteen chapters, each one studying this mystical relation of Christ to his Church from a different point of view, has its own text affixed to it; all of them taken together take the reader by means of many other Scripture quotations not only through the New Testament, but also—though more sparely—over the Old. It is unfortunate that there should be no Index to the book, not to speak of a separate Index of Scriptural citations. This, by the way, is one of our standing grievances against much of our devotional literature. The texts, on the whole, are appropriate, not used in that careless and carefree manner formerly so much in vogue which sees only the letter and not the spirit of a text. As a rule they are used to prove previous statements and consequently little developed, exegetically speaking. When the text is not used in its literalness, as v.g. the Ecce Homo on p. 167, the writer is careful to notify his reader. Some few texts receive more of that exegetical exposition which should become more and more the constant practice of teacher, writer and preacher, in the case of fundamental texts, always in accord with the rules of sound criticism. One such example of critical thoroughness is found in the chapter entitled *"Recapitulation" in Christ,* where Ephes. 1:9-10 "to re-establish all things in Christ" is examined in the light of the Greek text

ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ χριστῷ, stopping short however of the end of the text which explains τὰ πάντα as including the things "that are in heaven and on earth."

Rules of interpretation are necessary, and the author is well aware of it. The very first paragraph of the first chapter calls attention to the caution necessary in explaining terms that are transferred from things natural to things supernatural. This is well illustrated by the ideas of slavery and manumission as the external and civic background underlying some of the fundamental ideas concerning Redemption. Not all applications of Scripture passages are equally happy, and it is unfortunate that this should occur in connection with the title itself and in relation to the Blessed Virgin Mary under the two titles *The Mother of the Redeemer* and *The Mother of the Redeemed.* We quote:

> It is from the mysterious vital principle in the seedling that springs the lofty tree: consequently it is from it too that the branches draw their life. Mary is the seedling from which grew the Vine: hence too she is seed whence issue the branches that adhere to and adorn the Vine (p. 236).

The author should have remembered the caution he gave at the beginning concerning the figurative language of the Scriptures, the more so when the basis of the argument is a mere simile. Or the advice given by St. Thomas, following St. Augustine, to theologians, not to interpret ordinary Scripture texts open to various interpretations with that dogmatic assurance which would close the door to other and possibly better interpretations; first of all, because they have no right to do so, but secondly (and this is more important) "ne Scriptura ex hoc ab infidelibus derideatur; et ne eis via credendi praecludatur." Our doctrine concerning the Motherhood of Mary rests on much more solid foundations, even on Scripture grounds, nor is the author ignorant of this as the book demonstrates. Flimsy analogies obscure this more solid foundation and, to say the least, are much better omitted. Despite this criticism, the work is to be highly recommended to priests and religious, and to such of the laity as take an interest in things spiritual.

A. BELLWALD, S.M.

HAYYIM NAHMAN BIALIK, *And It Came to Pass.* Legends and Stories about King David and King Solomon. Translated by Herbert Danby. (New York: Hebrew Publishing Co., 1938). Pp. 281. $3.00.

These legends about David and Solomon were told and published separately in Hebrew between 1927 and 1934 by Bialik, who enjoys a considerable reputation among modern Hebrew poets. They were published in one volume under the title *Vay'hi Hayom* in 1934 shortly after the author's death. The author drew upon sources of various epochs but principally from his own fertile imagination. The result has been simple, lively stories with small pretense of truth. Some

are built around Scriptural accounts, as *The Scroll of Orpah*, others are entirely fabulous, as *The Bee*.

In the excellent English translation, Professor Danby has preserved the simple rhythm and Hebrew flavor of the original.

The volume is extraordinarily well printed and is adorned with splendid woodcuts which add to the charm of these light but fascinating tales.

EDWARD H. DONZÉ, S.M.

WILLIAM TEMPLE, Archbishop of York, *Readings in St. John's Gospel*. First Series, Chapter 1—12. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1939). Pp. xxxiii, 204. $2.75.

E. BASIL REDLICH, *An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel*. (New York; Longmans, Green and Co., 1939). Pp. 160. $2.00.

DOROTHY F. WILSON, *The Gospel Sources*. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938). Pp. 91. $.75.

These books are quite different in style and they are addressed to different readers. The Archbishop of York (Anglican) writes in the manner of an essayist for those who will follow serious reflection on the Gospel. Mr. Redlich is severely clear in an academic way, as one should be who writes a text book. Miss Wilson is plain of speech and addresses herself to the average reader of the Bible, to the one who attends Bible lectures. *Readings in St. John's Gospel* is much in the nature of a running commentary. Still all three agree in one regard that justifies their being taken together for review. They have the common purpose of conveying to the people the fruits of recent non-Catholic study of the Gospels in general, and of St. John in particular. They also follow the same type of criticism, that which we are accustomed to term "conservative."

Within these limits each author merits the praise of having done his work well. But the objective at which they aim may from some points of view give rise to question. This objective is worthy of attention mainly because it is basic to a wide non-Catholic literature on the Bible. We have no doubt of the excellent motives of these three authors, or of the majority of authors within this class. They desire to carry to the reading public what they apprehend as truth, with the support of scholarly research. But it is precisely there that the doubt is engendered. Much of the information which will be new to their readers, and which is destined to modify their concept of the Bible, belongs still in the category of theory or hypothesis. Much of it remains uncertain. Much of it will do little either to increase respect for the authority of the Scriptures, or to promote sounder interpretation. Hence the doubtful value of this literature.

A few propositions from the books before us may serve to illustrate what is meant.

All three authors accept as quite established the theory that Mt. and Lk. depend upon Mk. and "Q." Miss Wilson tells her readers that this is now "beyond all reasonable doubt." And yet the uncertainty of the question is evident from the way in which each works out the details of this dependency. None give the least hint that there are other opinions. Dom Chapman's *Matthew, Mark, and Luke* might at least have been taken into consideration. The last word has by no means been said on the "Synoptic Question," however confidently some authors may present their solutions.

All three admit that John the Apostle had some part in the authorship of the fourth Gospel, but each in varying degrees inclines away from the admission of his having written it. Temple thinks the actual writer to have been John the Elder, a disciple of the Apostle; but he is uncertain just what the Apostle contributed. Redlich claims that the Apostle was the author, but not in the modern sense of authorship; and in this he implies the same uncertainty. Miss Wilson is more positive: the author is John the Elder, who had only a brief acquaintance with the Apostle.

The more each of these authors inclines away from the apostolic origin of the fourth Gospel, the more he weakens its historic value. Temple and Redlich teach that the events recounted in this Gospel are of great value. Miss Wilson admits but "a deposit of genuine historical tradition." She does not tell how we are to decide what is and what is not genuine tradition. As to the discourses of our Lord in this Gospel, Miss Wilson says frankly that they were invented by the author. Temple and Redlich admit they have an historical basis, but add that as they now stand they reflect the author's interpretation in the light of the "Christian experience" of his time. Where fact and interpretation divide is hard to tell.

Finally, Miss Wilson instructs her readers in a type of Inspiration, Canonicity, and Inerrancy that will accomplish little good. Mark's Gospel had become authoritative by the year 85 A.D., "though not yet Scripture" (p. 58). "Matthew is not always scrupulous in the way he fits prophecy and events together, for he often alters the one or the other" (p. 59). She observes (p. 25) that the Gospels were not considered inspired in the first two centuries. "Neither Mark nor Proto-Luke is infallible, but both are of great historical value" (p. 69). This will undoubtedly be informative to her readers, but we may still question the value of the information or the use in handing it out.

Literature that will pass on to the reading public the sound and permanent results of biblical scholarship can be beneficial. But there are some rather obvious canons governing the type. It must guard against hastiness. Much that the scholar proposes is merely tentative.

A brief examination of biblical literature for the past generation or two will bring conviction on this point. Further, it should try to be helpful. Truth is always an assistance, when it is truth. Finally, the reader has a right to know when there exists another opinion that has good support. Such a variant opinion can be given, and should be given, without leaving nearly the uncertainty in the reader's mind that would result from a successive examination of the books now in question.

WILLIAM L. NEWTON.

CHARLES FRANKLIN KRAFT, *The Strophic Structure of Hebrew Poetry.* As illustrated in the first book of the Psalter. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938). Pp. iii, 117. $1.00.

Mr. Kraft, although not professedly a student of semitic lore, has with the scholarly aid of Professor W. A. Irwin given us a nice symposium on the study of the strophic structure of Hebrew Poetry. At the outset, some thirty-three pages are dedicated to the task of introducing the reader to the Origin of the Study and its Significant Developments. After a brief but pointed Critique of some more Recent Theories the author proceeds to an analysis of the first forty-one Psalms of the Psalter as illustrative of his views on poetic organization, after which, he concludes with a few pregnant pages on the nature and significance of strophic structure.

The contributions of scholars of the present century to the development and progress of Hebrew metrics are well known. Mr. Kraft recognizes this fact. Moeller, Lund, Condamin, among others, are names that consistently call forth respectful appreciation for work done in the field of biblical poetry. But Moeller's system of responsion, concatenation, and inclusion; Lund's thoroughgoing application of chiasmus, and Condamin's universal acceptance of strophe, antistrophe, and intermediate strophe are, according to Mr. Kraft, "theories that fall by their own weight." Obviously looking for a system of strophic structure that may be applied with equal fidelity to every poem of the Bible, the author takes the position that none of the above principles may be accepted as the universal mode of poetic organization (p. 105).

And yet, not unlike other poetry, Hebrew hymnology shows evidence of systematical organization of the poems into structures larger than the single line. To quote Mr. Kraft:

> .... this organization proceeds along certain understandable principles. But—and here is the chief claim for validity of the present writer's conclusions—these principles provide the simple basic methods of organization which the poet would naturally use to express his thought. On the one hand, the Hebrew poet is found not to have his freedom of expression

cramped into certain narrow, but intricate, paths which he must follow, nor, on the other hand, is his poetry merely a conglomerate collection of unrelated and momentary feelings set down without reference to logical order (p. 105).

To the question, "What is the nature of strophic structure as determined by the previous analysis of the first book of the Psalter?" he answers:

In the first place the presence of regular strophic structure in the poetry has become obvious, for, with the meagre exception of but four of the forty-one psalms, it is found that each psalm consists of one or more poems organized into structural units of two or more lines." In thirty-nine of these psalms two types of strophic units predominate: 1) the couplet, or simple unit formed by the conjunction of two lines, is by far the most frequent, as it appears in thirty of the psalms.... 2) the triad, the unit next larger than the couplet, composed of three lines, while much less frequent than the couplet, is a genuine type of strophic organization, as seen in at least twelve, and possibly sixteen psalms (p. 105-106).

In the return to a more objective appreciation of the fundamental position in Hebrew poetry of simple parallelism and, hence, the couplet, lies the chief merit of Kraft's book. He stresses, and we think rightly so, the too great value set on the intricate system of recent scholars who have evolved, in some instances, theories of poetic organization too closely resembling in complexity the canons of Greek and Latin prosody. The advice of Bellarmine is still timely and sound: "Illud autem hoc loco diligenter notandum et memoriae commendandum est, consuetudinem Davidis et aliorum prophetarum esse, ut idipsum bis repetant, ita ut una pars versiculi sit repetitio, vel explicatio alterius" (*Op. om.* vol. 11/2, page 9). Only with this observation in mind may we hope to read intelligently the hymns of God's servants.

Although the author insists that the solution of various textual problems is but a by-product of strophic investigation (p. 109), we feel that at times he loses sight of this excellent principle in his zeal and enthusiasm to recreate difficult couplet or triad, or establish the identity of some poem.

I believe that we have an evident example of the latter on page 106. I quote:

When within a particular psalm a change from couplet to triad structure, or vice versa, appears, as in Psalm 5, 27, 28, and 31, it becomes clear on logical and perhaps metrical grounds that the particular psalm is not a unit, but is the combination by editorial hands of two or more independent poems.

And again:

It must be pointed out, however, that in these cases of apparent combined triad-couplet structure it is quite probable that *textual corruption* has produced the phenomenon, and that originally the poem was purely composed of one or the other type of strophe.

To accuse Father Condamin, therefore, of "utter disregard of text-critical considerations .... in his analysis of single poems" (p. 26) because he accepts as one poem the whole of Am. 1:2–3;8, is, to say the least, daring and unwarranted on the part of Mr. Kraft in the face of the above quotations.

However, the outstanding qualities of Mr. Kraft's fine book far outweigh these few lapses. The book is excellently printed, has a generous and appropriate bibliography and should be in the hands of every student of the Bible. Unfortunately there is no index.

ALBERT MICHAEL CASEY, S.J.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK, *St. Paul* (New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1939). Pp. 256. $2.00.

This book contains the Swander Lectures delivered during 1938 at the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States at Lancaster, Pennsylvania. The author's purpose, expressed in a very brief foreword, is to make it easier for readers "to see St. Paul as a man and as a writer in the context of his times" (p. 9). In an introductory chapter sources of information are briefly discussed; then in successive chapters the influences affecting St. Paul at Tarsus, Jerusalem, and Damascus are considered. Two chapters are devoted to Paul's "Christian Period," the "earlier" and the "later," and then the letters of the Apostle are summarized with extreme brevity and very scant comment. A concluding chapter is devoted to "The Style and Thought of Paul."

Of the fourteen traditionally acknowledged Pauline Epistles Mr. Nock accepts but nine as "of undoubted authenticity." The Epistle to the Ephesians "must be omitted, as probably of the next generation, although the thoughts it expresses may be fairly regarded as derived from Paul and not inconsistent with his own thinking" (p. 11). The Pastoral Epistles, "belonging as they must do to a subsequent period, contain nevertheless information which may be genuine, if not fragments which may be authentic" (ibid.). The Epistle to the Hebrews "is certainly neither by Paul nor Pauline" (p. 145). According to Professor Nock the present two canonical Epistles to the Corinthians are an editorial combination of four or parts of four distinct Epistles, as follows:

(1) 2 Cor. 6:14–7:1 may be a fragment of the letter referred to in 1 Cor. 5:9.

(2) 1 Cor.

(3) 2 Cor. 10–13 is probably part of the "letter of sadness" (referred to in 2 Cor. 7:8) carried by Titus.

(4) 2 Cor. 1–9, a "letter of reconciliation" (pp. 171-173).

The Acts is regarded by the author as generally trustworthy because of its "notable accuracy in certain details of contemporary life which can be verified from the documentary and archaeological remains of the ancient world" (p. 12), although "the writer of Acts lived in a time in which the controversial issues of Paul's life had faded into obscurity and become unintelligible" (p. 15). The following indicates the author's views on the origin of the Gospels:

> The sayings of Jesus were valued from the earliest times of the movement, but their setting in the narrative framework of written Gospels was the product of an historical interest which arose at a time when the Church was an institution which had already a generation of corporate life behind it, and when the original disciples who had lived and eaten with Jesus had mostly died or grown old.... Under changed conditions it was necessary not only to supply the answers to some of the questions which piety asked, but also to reinforce that piety in daily life when it was no longer lived in the first intensity (p. 245).

The author makes very little attempt (beyond the very brief mention of the stock arguments from style, tone, contents, and language) to justify his rejection of five traditionally Pauline Epistles and his denial of the authenticity of Acts, nor does he mention that with the exception of the Epistle to the Hebrews there is an impressive weight of evidence in favor of their authenticity. But such is not his purpose. He proposes to take as a basis of his study those documents concerning whose authenticity and reliability there is general agreement, and on them reconstruct the processes which led to St. Paul's conversion and the devolpment of his theology as expressed in his admittedly genuine epistles.

In the chapter on "Tarsus and Jerusalem" the author, it seems to us, takes a very superficial view of Gal. 3:10 in alleging it as proof that St. Paul was unjust to the Pharisees; and the psychological reason assigned is very weak,—that "earlier convictions, passionately held and then passionately abandoned after a volcanic crisis, cannot but present themselves in distorted shapes" (p. 31).

In the chapter entitled "Damascus" the author, writing in a tone of restrained but unmistakable rationalism, seeks to give a natural explanation of the development of Christianity, and of Paul's conversion, stating in regard to this latter that "analogy suggests that his conversion was not the sudden thing which it seemed to him; the movement (Christianity) had probably fascinated him at the same time that it excited his deepest animosity, and it must have been the question, if the unvoiced question, of his life for some time" (p. 73). Yet the author frankly admits that we cannot explain "the drastic psychological crisis" which resulted in Paul's conversion. Neither could Paul, according to Mr. Nock (p. 68), although St. Paul gives what to us

seems a very satisfying explanation on several occasions (Gal. 1; 1 Cor. 15, and the accounts reported in various parts of the Acts).

The author takes as the basis of his chapters on St. Paul's Christian period the Acts, yet he freely questions or rejects its testimony in many cases. Thus the presence of St. Paul at the stoning of Stephen may be doubted (p. 33); "we cannot know" whether Peter and John were haled before the Sanhedrin as Acts 4 and 5 tell us (p. 61); there is no reason to suppose that the speech ascribed to Paul as having been given at Athens is authentic (p. 125); that Paul delivered the speech with the permission of the Roman commander such as is ascribed to him in Acts 25 "is highly doubtful; it would have been so stupid" (p. 138). The scene described in Acts 28:17 ff "if taken literally is impossible; it stands here for dramatic effect" (p. 142).

One might overlook this bland rejection of the trustworthiness of various accounts in Acts if the author's analysis of the Epistles which he gives in subsequent chapters were penetrating and enlightening. But it is entirely too brief and sketchy to afford more than a very superficial knowledge of the content of Paul's writings. And as to comment in explanation of Paul's views, it is very scant, and when it is given, it is frequently misleading and unjustifiable. Thus, for example, Mr. Nock says that Paul held that "the relation of Jesus to God was and remained one of subordination, but he held also that this subordination was temporarily in abeyance" (p. 79). Christ at the general resurrection will "hand over his kingship to God" (p. 155). Paul "shortly expected the Second Coming, expected to survive it" (p. 154). The problem of "virgins" in 1 Cor. 7 "apparently relates to a curious custom whereby men were spiritually betrothed to virgins and even lived with them without having physical relations" (p. 180). In regard to the words "do this in commemoration of me" Mr. Nock thinks that "the evidence is entirely against Jesus' having said them, or having thought of any repetition" of the Last Supper (p. 191). St. Paul did not regard the Eucharist as a sacrifice (p. 193).

Many of the foregoing opinions are obviously contrary to the mind of St. Paul and have been rejected by the best exegetical thought both Catholic and Protestant.

It seems to us therefore that Mr. Nock, instead of "making it easier for any reader to see St. Paul as a man and as a writer in the context of his times," has rather by this book tended to add to the general confusion which modern rationalism has introduced into the question of the origins of Christianity. The only points in the book which may be of assistance towards an easier understanding of St. Paul's epistles are those dealing with the difficulties which beset the interpretation of the Pauline Epistles (p. 13) and with the style and thought of St. Paul (p. 249 ff).

JOSEPH L. LILLY, C.M.

EDWARD F. SIEGMAN, C.PP.S., S.T.D., *The False Prophets of the Old Testament.* Summary of a dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Sacred Sciences of the Catholic University of America. (Washington, D. C.: Catholic University, 1939). Pp. 95. $2.00.

In the religious history of Israel, particularly just before the Babylonian captivity, the false prophets loom large. From that branch of biblical crticism which begins with the exclusion of the supernatural, they have received a doubtful courtesy. If there is no special intervention of God in human affairs, then the authority of the false prophet is quite as good as that of the "true" prophet; and the false prophet becomes a necessary step in a natural development leading—whither? Dr. Siegman shows from the texts that the true prophets viewed the situation in no such light; that they claimed an essential difference between their vocation and the self-constituted authority of their adversaries. A later chapter considers briefly the criteria which would enable their contemporaries to test the truth of such claims. These portions of the study provide a useful orientation in questions of profound importance from the apologetic standpoint; they represent careful analysis of an immense and scattered literature in several languages, much compressed in the presentation by reason of limited space.

A chapter on the historical origin of false prophetism is given *in extenso,* as it provides material and interpretations not readily available elsewhere to the Catholic scholar. Dr. Siegman finds in the narratives of Numbers, Samuel, and Kings, and in the prophets, a chain of texts which warrant the recognition of a permanent institution of collective prophecy native to Israel and not borrowed from the Canaanites, whose function from the very beginning would seem to have included the giving of oracles. Members of the bands of *nebiim* will have had a truly providential mission, but not necessarily a strictly supernatural one involving special revelation in all cases. This natural institution, based on the inclination of the people to an ecstatic cult, and sanctioned in its legitimate form by divine approval, will have provided in its later degeneration the source of false prophecy in Israel.

A highly serviceable bibliography on the prophets and an index of biblical passages complete a study for which Catholic biblical scholarship in this country can be truly grateful.

PATRICK W. SKEHAN.

HENRY JAMES REYNOLDS, M.D., *The World's Oldest Writings.* (Chicago, The Antiquities Corporation, 1938) Pp. xviii, 328. $4.95.

The purpose of Doctor Reynolds' works, as stated in the preface, is "to place before the reader in one volume an authoritative digest of

the whole subject of ancient writings." The "Biographical Sketch" (pp. v-viii) shows us the author's competence in the medical field but makes us wonder when he ever got time to compile an "authoriative" work on the ancient writings of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Palestine, China, India, Greece, and Rome. Actually Dr. Reynolds professes to be only a layman writing for laymen, and his book must be judged accordingly.

The longest and best part of the book treats of the Egyptian writings on monuments and papyri. He discusses these documents in their dynastic background. In treating of Assyrian and Babylonian writings, however, he is neither up to date nor accurate (he equates Babylonian and Sumerian). The section on Palestine contains only a very brief discussion of the Stele of Mesha and the Siloam inscription.

The book, on the whole, is interesting. But even in a popular work more accuracy is demanded than the author shows in the following statements: "Ptolemy Philadelphus, who had the Bible put into Greek. . ." (p. 68); "The date of the Tell El Armarna letters has now been quite accurately fixed by archeologists at somewhere between 2000 and 2200 B.C." (p. 211); "There is also from the same century (6th A.D.) a translation of the Pauline Epistles *from the Hebrew* to the Greek and Latin *by* Claromontanus" (p. 287); "As a result (of additions and alterations), including the New Testament, *several Bibles* and many 'versions' have eventually been evolved" (p. 291); The author's bibliography (pp. 297-298) shows why the discussions in his text are not brought up to date.

JAMES E. COLERAN, S.J.

GRACE SAXE, *Studies in First and Second Kings and First and Second Chronicles* (Chicago, Ill.: The Bible Institute Colportage Ass'n., 1939). Pp. 112. 35¢.

The author of these *Studies* has succeeded well in preparing a practical handbook for individual Bible study or for class work. Skillfully compressing into twenty-three lessons the vast history of Israel of more than four hundred years from the division of the nation to the Babylonian captivity, she follows the succession of events strictly as recorded in the chapters of our Bible editions and harmonizes the accounts with their parallel places as found in the books of Chronicles. The analytic discussions, based on actual reading of the biblical text indicated at the head of each lesson, popularize the historical content of these books without burdening the mind of the student with tedious chronological data or subtle solutions of exegetical difficulties. Ingenious charts and tables assist in grasping the structure of the books, in remembering the succession of kings and the duration of their reigns, and in evaluating the personal character of the rulers.

Two maps in the appendix augment the student's knowledge of biblical geography. Worthy of particular mention is the synoptic chart in which a synchronistic view of kings and prophets illustrates the history of that long period.

Since *Studies* is designed to further a practical and definite knowledge of the contents of the books themselves, the author insists that the printed questions following each lesson be answered by the student after a careful reading of the Scripture assignment for that lesson but before the analysis is consulted.

The work accepts the divine authority and inerrancy of the sacred books by acknowledging their divine inspiration. A number of sources at the disposal of the Sacred Authors (1 Kgs. 11:41; 1 Kgs. 14:19 ff.; 2 Par. 16:11; 27:7; 33:18) and recent discoveries of extra-biblical corroboratory material prove their human authority and exactitude. These extra-biblical testimonies include among many the inscription of Sheshonk I (954-924 B.C.) on a wall of the temple of Karnak in Egypt recording his campaign in Palestine (cf. 1 Kgs. 14:25), the inscription of Mesha King of Moab (the Moabite Stone, 9th century, cf. 2 Kgs. 3:4-24), and the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser III (860-825 B.C.), who collected tribute of Jehu in 842 B.C.

Studies will be heartily welcomed by lovers of the Scriptures, and the reviewer is happy to commend it as a trustworthy guide.

JOHN EV. UJLAKI, O.S.B.

IRA EISENSTEIN, *What We Mean by Religion.* A modern interpretation of the Sabbath and Festivals (New York: Behrman's, 1938). Pp. xiv, 145. $1.25.

What We Mean by Religion is presented by its author as an "elaboration of a basic aspect of Reconstructionism." It aims to present to the younger generation of American Jews in a simplified, popular way the approach to Jewish religious tradition of Dr. Mordecai M. Kaplan, as represented in the latter's "The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion."

No one whose concept of Judaism is a religion based on divine revelation will find either the God of revelation, or religion as he understands it, in this book. The positive element of the presentation makes of the Jewish Sabbath and the various religious festivals each the symbol of some abstraction: the perfect life, a better world, human nature remade, co-operation, freedom, righteous law, and the power of religion. The place in which these abstractions are to find increasing and ultimately full realization is the present world; the time, the lifetime not of the individual, but of the human race. There is however, of necessity a negative side to such a scheme of things; and it is

when the author indicates to his readers what he does not mean by the word 'God.' Another way of asking the same question is: what is God? The answer is : 'God' means in our day, *all that makes our lives worth while*.... The word 'God' is a symbol which helps us to keep in mind all the forces for good" (pp. 138-39). "Nevertheless, from our point of view, it is very valuable for us to think of God as the *creator*, providing that we mean by this the following: the world is constructed in such a way that *anything is possible*" (p. 13). "We should make up our minds that the perfect life is not to be found in some new world in the far distant future, but is to be found on this earth, and as soon as men determine to bring it into being" (p. 11). "How can we make our sense of responsibility as broad as possible?... We can do this by remembering that when we are at our best we are making use of the force in us which we call God" (p. 59). This is not Reconstruction in the sense of building again on the old foundations; it reconstrues rather than reconstructs. Its spiritual kinship is not with historical Judaism at all, but with those currents in our western world which have supervened upon the surrender of Christian beliefs, though still in many cases clinging to the name of Christianity. Here only the symbols are Jewish; the religion is religion without God.

For the most part, the gulf between the Judaism of his ancestors and *What We Mean by Religion* is fairly well indicated by the author's own surveys of Jewish tradition regarding the various feasts. At times, however, that position so different from his own is not well stated. "What did our ancestors mean by saying that God is holy? They meant that *life itself* is of utmost importance, and it is wrong to be indifferent to life" (pp. 20-21). "According to the Prophets, therefore, sin was not just the failure to carry out certain ceremonies; sin was committing a wrong against a fellow man" (p. 48). The ideas of sacrifice and of prayer among the ancients are reduced to "feeding the gods and flattering the gods," and placed on a par with magic (pp. 137-38). The portrayal of pre-exilic Israel is somewhat naïve: "Yahweh, the God of the Israelites, came to be the symbol of justice, freedom and peace, and the people therefore flocked to the worship of Yaweh [*sic*] and forgot about Baal" (p. 126).

PATRICK W. SKEHAN.

JOSEPH REIDER, PH.D. *The Holy Scriptures. Deuteronomy with Commentary.* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 5697-1937). Pp. xliv, 355. $2.50.

In this commentary on Deuteronomy the Jewish Publication Society of America presents the second volume of a series of commentaries on the Bible. The first volume (The Book of Micah with Commentary, Max L. Margolis) made its appearance in 1908. "The series is intend-

ed for the teacher, the interested pupil, and the general reader, and the commentaries are therefore written in as simple and popular form as is commensurate with clearness and accuracy" (Foreword). Since the work is intended primarily for the Jewish reader it emphasizes the Jewish point of view and the traditional Jewish interpretation.

The purpose of the Society in the publication of a popular type of biblical commentary has been very happily achieved in this contribution on Deuteronomy by Dr. Reider, Professor of Biblical Philology at Dropsie College. In the Introduction (pp. xi-xxxvii) the critical questions attaching to authorship and date, religious ideas, and style are briefly and lucidly discussed. The author "while acknowledging some of the positive results of the modern historical-critical school.... does not accept the so-called higher criticism of Graf, Kuenen and Wellhausen" (Preface, p. vii). In this orthodox standpoint Dr. Reider is supported by a number of recent non-Catholic scholars, as well as the full phalanx of Catholic scholarship. Time has discredited the apodictic assertion of Wellhausen that Deuteronomy "was composed in the time in which it was discovered" (Prolegomena). Recent critical studies by non-Catholic scholars (Hempel, Oestreicher, Staerk, Loehr, Sternberg) give evidence that the pendulum of critical opinion swings towards the orthodox view.

In the discussion of style the author observes that "diction and style are nearly always conditioned by the contents of a book" (p. xxiii). This is true of all periods of history. We think that attention should be directed to the preponderant influence of the "literarischer Gattung" on the style of the writers of antiquity. The reader for whom the book is primarily intended will not be too well versed in ancient canons of writing and will be prone to make the comparison with contemporary literary forms. Neither does this generic statement as such have much weight against the critical arguments from style.

The text and commentary are to be lauded for the technical perfection of the format. The skillful use of different type makes it practical for consultation, and renders reading facile. The translation is conservative, adhering to the traditions of the classical English versions for the most part, but not slavishly; ease and clarity are not sacrificed for traditional phrasing. The commentary itself is in keeping with the more popular nature of the work; it is not encumbered with scientific apparatus. It achieves its purpose, which is to make the text understandable. Critical questions are not neglected, but are discussed briefly; the traditional and critical standpoint regarding laws, ritual, etc. are presented.

The appearance at this time of a commentary on Deuteronomy according to the traditional norms of interpretation is welcome to Catholic scholars. Is it not significant? Is not the alignment of

scholars with higher criticism due rather to their Weltanschauung than to the overwhelming evidence of critical research?

JOHN J. DOUGHERTY.

LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, *The Pharisees, The Sociological Background of their Faith.* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1938). 2 vols. Pp. xxviii, 1-442; 443-795.

This extensive monograph of the Professor of Theology at the Jewish Theological Seminary of America is the second of a series being published under the Morris Loeb Fund created for the preparation and publication of scholarly works devoted to the interests of Judaism. The two volumes give evidence of painstaking care and tireless research. The forty pages of bibliography indicate somewhat the extent of the task which the author set himself. He has succeeded in condensing remarkably well the teaching and practice of both the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and has endeavored throughout to catch and present the point of view of these interesting sects, so as to give some explanation of their differences of opinion on so many points of religious belief and custom.

Calling attention to the title we might notice that the book deals proportionately as much with the Sadducees as with the Pharisees. The sub-title gives the author's approach to the question. In his treatment of the ramifications of Pharisaic and Sadducean teaching against the sociological background, the author is synthetic even to excess. He claims that originally the Sadducees were aristocratic farmers of the lowlands, the Pharisees poor plebeians of the highlands, principally of Jerusalem. From the variety of these circumstances arose the differences of interpretation of the Scriptures, which later gave rise to the sects, because these farmers and town-folk "were not so much interested in agreeing with Scripture as in having the Scripture agree with them" (p. 102). This rather uncomplimentary principle, which is rather pivotal in the discussion, is made more general and succinct later (p. 131): "Customs create exegesis, not exegesis customs." The author then describes the differences between the customs of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, ingeniously attempting to show the urban origin of the one, and the rural origin of the other. At times customs of the Pharisees are traceable back to reminiscences of their still earlier life in the country. One gets the impression of going around in a circle, not quite sure whether these origins are a premise or the conclusion. In later chapters, the Sadducees are simply "the patricians" and the Pharisees, "the plebeians."

A few instances will exemplify the results of the author's method. The rudeness of the Sadducees and the refinement of the Pharisees,

to which Josephus refers, is traceable to the rusticity of the one and the urbanity of the other. Both parties rejoiced at Sukkot, the Sadducees because of the in-gathering (original purpose), the Pharisees because of the coming rains which would fill their empty cisterns. The Sadducean farmers celebrated Shabuot as the occasion of the offering of the first barley, the Pharisaiac town folk as the anniversary of the Mosaic revelations. The Pharisees, largely of the one town of Jerusalem where alone the laws of purity were irksome, as a matter of principle, insisted on a more lenient interpretation of the priestly purity for the sacrifice of the red heifer; the Sadducee farmers, who kept legally pure only for the festivals, had no reason to depart from the letter of the law. The highland Pharisees kindled fire for necessary heat and light, in preparation for the Sabbath; the lowland Sadducees, retiring with the chickens, extinguished the useless fires in making ready for the sabbatical rest. The town folk merged houses to render practical the law concerning the carrying of burdens on the Sabbath, the farmers had no such need on their ample estates. The poor plebeians attributed their sorry lot to fate and looked for a better life in the resurrection; the rich patricians, attributing their success to themselves, were self-determined and satisfied with the rewards of this world.

The author traces the whole concept of the universal brotherhood of man under one Lord of the universe to the Babylonian exile, where Yahweh was worshipped in a land which was not Israel. The chapter on the ideals of peace and human equality during the exile is largely a running commentary of "Deutero-Isaiah," in which the Servant of Yahweh is identified with the people of Israel. Any scholar would derive much help in such a study from Condamin, who is not even listed in the bibliography.

Most readers would prefer to find more on the differences among the Pharisees themselves, especially between the schools of Shammai and Hillel. Such interesting questions as that of divorce are not treated.

The vast material is presented in a way that is readable and thoroughly interesting. The absence of footnotes renders the page more attractive, but inconveniences those who might like to glance at the sources by necessitating reference to the end of the second volume.

Certainly no one who studies the Pharisees in the future can afford to do without consulting this competent investigation.

EDWARD H. DONZÉ, S.M.

LUCILLE PAPIN BORDEN, *Once—In Palestine* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939). Pp. 177. $1.50.

In a manner all her own, fantastical or imaginative, Mrs. Borden tells the story of Christ's life in her latest book, "Once—In Palestine."

Although the book presents a living picture of scenes based on the Gospel narrative of our Lord's life, it is primarily a book of devotion and meditation.

The first part treats of the Virgin Mary, the circumstances of Christ's Birth and early childhood; in the second part, the author recounts briefly some of the events of Holy Week: the treason of Judas, the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Christ.

The book affords pleasant reading; but the reader should be cautioned not to confuse the real events of the Gospel narrative with the devotional thoughts it inspires.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Some of these may be reviewed in subsequent issues.)

The Macmillan Company, New York, N. Y.:

The Gospel Sources. By DOROTHY F. WILSON. 1938. Pp. 91. $.75.

Readings in St. John's Gospel. First Series, Chap. 1-12. By WILLIAM TEMPLE. 1939. Pp. xxxiii, 204. $2.75.

In the Steps of Moses the Conqueror. By LOUIS GOLDING. 1938. Pp. 426. $2.50.

American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, Conn.:

Gerasa, City of the Decapolis. Edited by CARL H. KRAELING (Yale University). 1938. Pp. xxii, 616, with 47 Figures, 143 Plates and 47 Plans. $10.00.

Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, Wisconsin:

Paul. By REV. C. LATTEY, S.J. 1939. Pp. xiv, 182. $2.00.

The Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Holy Scriptures with Commentary, Numbers. By JULIUS H. GREENSTONE, PH. D., L.H.D. 1939. Pp. 373. $2.50.

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, N. Y.:

A Diagram of Synoptic Relationships. By ALLAN BARR, M.A. In Four Colours. $1.25.

Bloch Publishing Company, New York, N. Y.:

A History of Jewish Literature from the Close of the Bible to our own Days. By MEYER MAXMAN, PH.D. 1939. Pp. xvi, 562. $3.50.

Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, England:

A Two Year Public Ministry. The Bellarmine Series Edited by the Jesuit Fathers of Heythrop College. By REV. EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE, S.J. 1939. Pp. 170. 7s 6d.

Longmans, Green & Company, New York, N. Y.:

The Route of the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt. By A. LUCAS. 1939. Pp. 99. $1.35.

An Introduction to the Fourth Gospel. By E. BASIL REDLICH. 1939. Pp. 160. $2.00.

Harper & Brothers, New York, N. Y.:

St. Paul. By ARTHUR NOCK. 1939. Pp. 255. $2.00.

The Bible Institute Colportage Association of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.:

Studies in I and II Kings and I and II Chronicles. By GRACE SAXE. 1939. Pp. 112. $.35.

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.:

The False Prophets of The Old Testament: Summary of a Dissertation submitted by EDWARD F. SIEGMAN, C.PP.S. 1939. Pp. 95. $2.00.

Marianum. Ephemerides Mariologiae. Cura Patrum Ordinis Servorum Mariae. Januarius, 1939. Annus I, Fasc. 1.